

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petitions of Wright, Lybarger & Funk, of Warsaw, and L. Neiswander, of Holmesville, Ohio—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Petition of many residents of Tennessee, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Knoxville (Tenn.) Lodge, No. 160, and Morristown (Tenn.) Lodge, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring the preservation of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Clinton Council, No. 83, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for legislation to more effectually restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Manufacturers and Producers' Association of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring a higher tariff on tannic acid—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Oronogo (Mo.) Circle Mining Company, for a duty on zinc ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Box Manufacturers, favoring increase of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against reduction of tariff on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York members of the American Paper and Pulp Association, against removal of duty from wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOK: Petition of employees of Harry C. Aberle & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., for retention and adoption of the proposed rates of duty on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frank A. Schimpf and others, favoring a higher rate of duty on lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petitions of J. H. P. Peterson, of Maquoketa; L. M. Stahle, of North Liberty; and Theo Martin, of Bellevue, all in the State of Iowa, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of Waynesboro (Pa.) Lodge, No. 731, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring a reserve for the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Marblehead Lime Company, of Chicago, Ill., for an investigation by the United States Geological Survey on the subject of lime—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Paul Taylor Brown Company, of New York, against a proposed tariff on fruit with sugar added—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New England Dry Goods Association, against the proposed tariff on hosiery and gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chicago Mill and Lumber Company, of Chicago, Ill., against reduction on lumber and its products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of job printers of Salem, Mass., against practice of Post-Office Department printing return envelopes free of charge—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of residents of Danvers and Groveland, Mass., against a duty on coffee and tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Paul N. Chaput, of Salem, Mass., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, against elimination of the countervailing duty on petroleum—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring establishment of a line of steamers by the National Government touching all points on the Pacific coast and connecting at Panama with the Panama Railway—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of citizens of San Jose and numerous citizens of San Francisco and Redwood City, all in the State of California, protesting against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of S. P. Ulch (H. R. 1964)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of W. H. Wright & Sons and other merchants and citizens of Ogden, Utah, against an increase of tariff on gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KÜSTERMANN: Petition of employees of Green Bay (Wis.) Paper and Fibre Company, against reduction of duty on plain paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Brandon, Minn., against a duty on teas and coffees—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Hardwood Manufacturers' Association of the United States, against any reduction of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of certain residents of Culbertson, Nebr., against parcels-post and postal savings bank legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STURGISS: Petitions of Andrew Corrothers, S. J. Walter, William Held, J. T. Boyce, and J. M. Cost, all of Grafton, W. Va., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Leggerman Brothers, New York, against increase of duty on chicory—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Protest of the Lumbermen's Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., against any reduction in the rates of duty upon articles in the lumber schedule of the Dingley tariff act—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of Martin Jancer, against reduction of the duty on barley, wheat, and other farm products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of William Chenoueth and other citizens of Gassaway, Burnsville, and Sutton, all in the State of West Virginia, against parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 25, 1909.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Edward E. Hale.

Mr. CLARENCE D. CLARK, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of useless papers, books, and so forth, on the files of the Department of the Interior, which are not needed in the transaction of public business and are of no permanent value or historical interest. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The Chair appoints the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment of the committee on the part of the Senate.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and two opinions in the cause of John T. Ayres, executor, and the Chickasaw Nation v. United States (S. Doc. No. 2) which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 12) authorizing an additional number of copies of the daily RECORD to be furnished to Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Casein Manufacturing Company, of New York City, N. Y., praying for a protective duty on casein and lactarene, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico, praying that a duty of at least 5 cents per pound be imposed on all foreign coffee, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition from the olive importers' committee, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for a reduction of the duty on olives, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas for the transportation development of the great industrial interior of the continent of North America nature has provided, on the one hand, the Great Lakes chain, which is the greatest inland sea in the world, and, on the other hand, the Mississippi River and tributaries, which have no equal as natural transportation channels for a great internal commerce;

Whereas the freight tonnage shipped from the port of Duluth-Superior exceeds that of New York or any other American port, while the net tonnage passing from Lake Superior through the Soo Canal is three times that which passes through the Suez Canal in the trade between Europe and the Orient, and the Great Lakes fleet is the greatest merchant fleet which floats the American flag;

Whereas Minnesota produces and ships to eastern furnaces annually close upon 30,000,000 tons of iron ore, which exceeds one-half of the iron-ore product of America and one-fourth that of the world, and whereas this iron ore should be converted into iron and steel by Minnesota labor on Minnesota soil for distribution throughout the Mississippi Valley and westward, and a great industrial plant for such purpose is now being established at Duluth;

Whereas Minnesota and the near-by upper Mississippi Valley States of Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota annually produce about 300,000,000 bushels of wheat and 900,000,000 bushels of corn, oats, and other coarse grains, besides a vast tonnage of flour, lumber, live stock, and dairy products, much of which seeks transportation to the markets of the world; and

Whereas the Great Lakes system, which connects with the Atlantic seaboard, and the Mississippi River, which flows to the Gulf of Mexico, have their common source in Minnesota, the tributaries of the upper Mississippi extending within 50 miles of Lake Superior, and the union of the Great Lakes and Mississippi watersheds by canalization would make the greatest internal waterway of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That it is the sense of the legislature of Minnesota that the commerce of this great lake and river should be connected by a national waterway canal;

Resolved, That such waterway is of the greatest importance to this State and Nation, and we hereby pledge the cooperation of the Commonwealth of Minnesota with our Federal Government in the construction of such canal and in canalizing the upper Mississippi River;

Resolved further, That our delegation in Congress be, and is hereby, urged to impress upon Congress the necessity for immediate action in constructing such canal, and that a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Senator and Representative from this State.

Adopted by the house of representatives March 11, 1909.

ARCHIBALD H. VERNON, *Chief Clerk.*

Adopted by the senate March 16, 1909.

GEO. W. PEACHEY, *Secretary of Senate.*

Mr. NELSON presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution.

Whereas fallen trees and tree tops and sand bars and other obstructions which have gathered and formed around and about the same at many and various places in the channel of the lower Minnesota River seriously clog the channel thereof, and seriously impede and practically make impossible the natural navigation thereof, and operate to destroy navigation thereof and the natural commerce thereon, and, moreover, in the seasons of the high waters thereof necessarily cause numerous destructive overflows of said river, at many and various places and in many and various localities in the valley thereof, destroying, annually, hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of the cultivated crops of the valley thereof; and

Whereas it is supremely necessary and of paramount importance that said obstructions be early and effectively removed from the channel of said river in order to promote the natural and profitable navigation thereof and develop the natural commerce thereon, and in order to prevent—and such removal is necessary to prevent—the annual, frequent, and destructive overflows thereof, as aforesaid, and in order to prevent the great annual loss and damage inflicted upon the settlers along said river valley resulting from the overflows of the said river, and which are caused by the obstructions above referred to; and

Whereas the said river and the channel thereof and the care thereof, are under the jurisdiction of the United States Government, said river being classed as navigable: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our Representatives in Congress be, and they hereby are, requested and urged to forthwith use their influence and utmost endeavor without delay to secure from the Congress of the United States authority for the use of, and appropriation necessary for the early use of, government dredges and snag boats sufficient and adequate for the purpose of the early and complete removal from the channel of the said river of all sand bars and other obstructions therein materially obstructing or impeding or preventing or making impracticable the natural navigation thereof, or materially injurious to the natural commerce thereon, or which necessarily cause the destructive overflows thereof: And be it further

Resolved, That an authenticated copy hereof be mailed to each of our said Representatives.

ADOLPH O. EBERHART,
Lieutenant-Governor.
A. J. ROCKNE, *Speaker.*

Adopted by the house of representatives February 17, 1909.

ARCHIBALD H. VERNON, *Chief Clerk.*

Adopted by the senate February 18, 1909.

GEO. W. PEACHEY, *Secretary.*

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry granite producers of St. Cloud, Minn., remonstrating against a lower rate of duty on rough or finished granite, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the imposition of a higher duty on lithographic products, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a brief resolution adopted by the Board of Trade of Manchester, N. H., which I ask shall be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution of Manchester (N. H.) Board of Trade.

The Manchester (N. H.) Board of Trade on March 16, 1909, unanimously adopted the following resolution expressing the attitude of that body toward railroad legislation:

"Whereas the manufacturing establishments of New Hampshire employed at the census of 1905 nearly 70,000 persons, receiving about \$30,000,000 annually in salaries and wages; and

"Whereas these establishments, in competition with rivals nearer the source of raw material and the centers of purchasing population, are largely dependent upon swift and regular freight service; and

"Whereas there is a widespread apprehension that public hostility to railroads will imperil their borrowing capacity and impair their confidence in the wisdom of extensive improvements: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Manchester Board of Trade urges the New Hampshire Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence in favor of conservatism as to enactments and decrees affecting railroads."

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 97, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. CULLOM presented a resolution of the legislature of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House resolution 40. Offered by Mr. Lederer, March 17, 1909.

Whereas there has been recently organized in this country a gigantic trade combination and monopoly in connection with the manufacture and sale of moving-picture films, machines, and the apparatus used therewith; and

Whereas such combination is intended to destroy competition and to secure a monopoly in this line of business to the parties to such combination: Be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Illinois in Congress are hereby requested to oppose any increase of duty on imported manufactured moving-picture films and all other legislation which may tend to aggrandize such monopoly: Be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Illinois in Congress are hereby requested to aid in procuring an investigation of such monopoly to be made by federal intervention and in instituting proceedings and passing laws to suppress such combination and monopoly: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Illinois in Congress by the clerk of this house.

Mr. BROWN presented a petition of the Union Veteran Republican Club of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation granting a pension of \$1 per day to soldiers of the Mexican and civil wars, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 739, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Plattsmouth, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. BOURNE presented a joint memorial of the legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Intercoastal Canals and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, F. W. Benson, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 1, petitioning Congress to favor the extension of the service now established and in operation from New York to Colon to all Pacific coast points, etc., with the original thereof, together with the indorsements thereon, filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon on the

16th day of March, 1909, and that it is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol, at Salem, Oreg., this 17th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

F. W. BENSON,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 1.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there is great need of transportation competition on the Pacific coast via the Isthmus of Panama for the use and benefit of the producers and consumers of the entire Pacific coast; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has established and is maintaining from points on the Atlantic coast to the city of Colon, on the Isthmus of Panama, a line of steamships operated in connection with the Panama Railroad; and

Whereas because of recent advances in transcontinental railroad freight rates the freight tolls into and out of the State of Oregon and into and out of other Pacific coast States have been advanced so that several millions of dollars per annum will be exacted from the producers and consumers of this section by reason of said advance, and that this action on the part of the railroads results not only in the levy of an enormous additional tax, but also necessarily restricts the output of our fisheries and manufactures and the sales of the products of the farm and orchard: Therefore be it

Resolved, First, That your memorialists favor the extension, at as early date as possible, of the service now established and in operation from New York to Colon to all Pacific coast points in order that relief both in rates and in additional facilities may be afforded to the manufacturers, merchants, and producers of the Pacific coast.

Second, That we favor the passage of the bill introduced in Congress by Representative MCLACHLAN, of California, having for its purpose the establishing and operating of a through line of steamers in conjunction with the Panama Railroad from all Atlantic coast ports to all Pacific coast ports.

Third, That in the event this is found impracticable or that there will be unusual delay, we favor the establishment of an American-owned and American-manned line of steamships between all Atlantic ports, said line to be assisted in its establishment and maintenance by the department of the General Government in all lawful ways.

Fourth, That this memorial be forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, with the request that they present the same and that they exert all possible efforts to have the wishes of this State as contained in this memorial carried out, and that they be further requested to present a copy of these resolutions to the President of these United States and to the Secretary of War.

Passed the House March 15, 1909.

C. N. MCARTHUR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 15, 1909.

JAY BOWERMAN,
President of the Senate.

Indorsements: Senate joint memorial No. 1. William H. Barry, chief clerk. Executive department, State of Oregon. Received March 16, 1909. Filed March 16, 1909. F. W. Benson, secretary of state.

Mr. BOURNE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the establishment of a line of steamships from the Pacific coast ports to Panama, which were referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

Mr. KEAN presented the petition of S. Wegner, of Bound Brook, N. J., praying for the repeal of the duty on lumber, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Summit, N. J., praying for the appointment of a permanent tariff commission, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Local Division No. 688, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Elizabeth, N. J., remonstrating against the appointment of a permanent tariff commission, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NIXON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nevada, praying for the imposition of a protective duty on zinc ores, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES presented a joint memorial of the legislature of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 6.

To the honorable Senate and
House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Whereas state road No. 5 has been located in the State of Washington, which road, when completed, will afford communication between Chehalis, in Lewis County, and North Yakima, in Yakima County, in said State; and

Whereas in Yakima County said road has been completed to the east line of the forest reserve, and a large portion of said road has been built in Lewis County, west of said reserve; and

Whereas said road as laid out and constructed passes through the Rainier Forest Reserve, as follows:

Beginning on the east boundary of the Rainier Forest Reserve on the west boundary of township 12 north, range 7 east, Willamette meridian, Washington, near the bank of the Cowlitz River, and running thence up the Cowlitz River and its tributaries to the Carlton Pass, in the summit of the Cascade Mountains; thence down Bumping River and the Natchez River to the east boundary of said forest reserve on the east boundary

of township 16 north, range 14 east, Willamette meridian, Washington; and

Whereas said road so passing through said reserve will be of great benefit and convenience in the inspection and preservation of the forests, and will also relieve the Government from the expense of constructing roads or trails through said reserve;

Therefore, your memorialists, the members of the eleventh legislative session assembled of the State of Washington, hereby most respectfully urge that said road be constructed through said forest reserve at the expense of the Government of the United States.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

Yours, truly,

J. E. LEONARD.

Mr. JONES presented a memorial of the Merchants' Protective Association, of Elma, Wash., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on coffee, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Washington, remonstrating against the removal of the duty on coal, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for a reduction of the duty on wool, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. I present a memorial of the legislature of North Dakota, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULBERSON. I suggest that a memorial from the legislature of a State ought to be read and not merely printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. I should be glad to have the memorial read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the memorial will be read. No objection is heard.

The memorial was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas the present tariff system has created conditions in the United States which need to be remedied, especially in such cases where it has brought a number of necessities of life under the absolute control of a small number of unprincipled trust magnates, we believe in a wise and adequate reduction; but

Whereas the tariff rates now existing for the protection of farm products have proven to be highly beneficial to all agricultural States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That our congressional delegation be respectfully requested to use all honorable means to have the present tariff rates on all farm products retained.

I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the senate and was concurred in by the house of representatives of the eleventh legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota.

JAMES W. FOLEY, Secretary.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask that the joint resolution be read. I desire to say in explanation of my insistence that these resolutions be read that, without reference to the merits of the resolutions themselves, we owe a certain respect to the legislatures of the States of the Union in having them read and entered at length in the RECORD. I insist that such resolutions shall be read.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of South Dakota:

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota, and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 17, as passed by the legislature of 1909 of the State of South Dakota, with all the indorsements thereon and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 25th day of February, 1909.

[SEAL.]

SAMUEL C. POLLEY,
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to maintain and increase the tariff upon wool.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring):

Whereas foreign competition in the wool market is so strong that the price of wool in the United States is frequently reduced below the price of production and a great and profitable industry is crippled thereby; and

Whereas it is with proper protection perfectly possible for the farmers of the United States to not only supply the entire American demand for wool, but to, as well, produce large quantities for exportation: Therefore,

Resolved, That the legislature of the State of South Dakota hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to maintain the tariff upon wool in the revision of the tariff schedules now in contemplation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota*:

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota, and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 8 as passed by the legislature of 1909, and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 2d day of February, 1909.

[SEAL.]

SAMUEL C. POLLEY,
Secretary of State.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to open Indian reservations in South Dakota.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring): Whereas over 10,000,000 acres of fine agricultural land in the west half of the State is Indian reservation, unimproved and undeveloped, and so situated as to retard greatly the development of territory already opened to settlement in the west half of the State; and

Whereas the opening of the land would benefit the Indians, would be the home of thousands of settlers, and would materially add to the revenues of the State:

We therefore submit to our United States Senators and Members of Congress the advisability of causing such treaties to be made with the Indians on each of the reservations within this State, and the enactment of such laws as will open all, or as much as possible, of the territory embraced in these reservations with the utmost dispatch.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota*:

I, Samuel C. Polley, secretary of state of South Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 12 as passed by the legislature of 1909, together with all indorsements thereon and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 9th day of February, 1909.

[SEAL.]

SAMUEL C. POLLEY,
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution.

A joint resolution and memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to make Fort Meade, S. Dak., a brigade post, with permanent brick or stone barracks, officers' quarters, and other buildings.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring):

Whereas Fort Meade is centrally located with reference to all the Indian reservations in North and South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming, upon which there are quartered about 40,000 uncivilized Indians; and

Whereas Fort Meade is the only military post in South Dakota, and the only post in the whole Northwest possessing the required strategic advantages to exercise surveillance over the Indians and afford proper protection to the property and people of this rich and rapidly developing country; and

Whereas the lines of railroad now in operation offer transportation facilities over four lines in four different directions, forming a basis for military movements, enabling troops to quickly reach any point of trouble; and

Whereas Fort Meade has a large timber reservation with the Black Hills Forest Reserve, upon which there is pine timber and an abundant supply of pure mountain spring water, and also a military reservation, 2 miles by 6 miles in area, with all available adjoining land needed for the requirements of a brigade post, which collectively would include the level and rolling prairie, open and wooded streams of water, bluffs and brakes, bare hills and timbered mountains, offering all practicable varieties of country for maneuvers; and

Whereas the hospital records show that the pure, malaria-free, bracing climate renders Fort Meade the healthiest post garrisoned in America; and

Whereas Fort Meade is in process of rebuilding as a two-squadron cavalry post, there having been built in the past six years brick and stone barracks for eight troops, hospital, post exchange, line and field officers' quarters, noncommissioned officers' quarters, bakery, powder magazine, stables, fire station, water system and concrete reservoir, sewer system and stable drain, macadamized roads and cement walks, electric-light wiring, and other permanent improvements, modern and up-to-date and costing over \$600,000: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor, and earnestly urge the Congress of the United States by proper enactment to designate, Fort Meade as a brigade post and provide for the erection of additional barracks, quarters, and other structures ample and suitable for the proper garrison thereof: And be it further

Resolved, That we request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to employ their best efforts to compass this end.

Mr. SHIVELY presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 1077, of Greencastle; of Local Lodge No. 560, of Frankfort; of Local Lodge No. 368, of Elwood; of Local Lodge No. 981, of East Chicago; of Local Lodge No. 270, of New Albany; of Local Lodge No. 155, of Fort Wayne; and of Local Lodge No. 235, of South Bend, all of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which were

referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of the Tell City Improvement Association, of Tell City; the Commercial Club of Lawrenceburg; the Commercial Club of Michigan City; and the Coal Exchange of Jeffersonville, all in the State of Indiana, praying that an appropriation of \$50,000,000 be made for the improvement of the inland waterways of the country, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CLAPP. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Minnesota for reading and reference.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Joint resolution.

Whereas fallen trees and tree tops and sand bars and other obstructions which have gathered and formed around and about the same at many and various places in the channel of the lower Minnesota River seriously clog the channel thereof, and seriously impede and practically make impossible the natural navigation thereof, and operate to destroy navigation thereof and the natural commerce thereon, and, moreover, in the seasons of the high waters thereof necessarily cause numerous destructive overflows of said river, at many and various places and in many and various localities in the valley thereof, destroying annually hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of the cultivated crops of the valley thereof; and

Whereas it is supremely necessary and of paramount importance that said obstructions be early and effectively removed from the channel of said river in order to promote the natural and profitable navigation thereof and develop the natural commerce thereon and in order to prevent, and such removal is necessary to prevent, the annual, frequent, and destructive overflows thereof, as aforesaid, and in order to prevent the great annual loss and damage inflicted upon the settlers along said river valley resulting from the overflows of the said river and which are caused by the obstructions above referred to; and

Whereas the said river and the channel thereof, and the care thereof, are under the jurisdiction of the United States Government, said river being classed as navigable: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our Representatives in Congress be, and they hereby are, requested and urged to forthwith use their influence and utmost endeavor, without delay, to secure from the Congress of the United States authority for the use of, and appropriation necessary for the early use of government dredges and snag boats sufficient and adequate for the purpose of the early and complete removal from the channel of the said river of all sand bars and other obstructions therein materially obstructing or impeding or preventing or making impracticable the natural navigation thereof or materially injurious to the natural commerce thereon or which necessarily cause the destructive overflows: And be it further

Resolved, That an authenticated copy hereof be mailed to each of our said Representatives.

ADOLPH O. EBERHARD,
Lieutenant-Governor.
A. J. ROCKNE, Speaker.

Adopted by the house of representatives February 17, 1909.

ARCHIBALD H. VERNON,
Chief Clerk.

Adopted by the senate February 18, 1909.

GEO. W. PEACHEY, Secretary.

Mr. CLAPP. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of Minnesota, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Whereas for the transportation development of the great industrial interior of the continent of North America, nature has provided, on the one hand, the Great Lakes chain, which is the greatest inland sea in the world, and, on the other hand, the Mississippi River and tributaries, which have no equal as natural transportation channels, for a great internal commerce;

Whereas the freight tonnage shipped from the port of Duluth-Superior exceeds that of New York, or any other American port, while the net tonnage passing from Lake Superior through the Soo Canal is three times that which passes through the Suez Canal in the trade between Europe and the Orient, and the Great Lakes fleet is the greatest merchant fleet which floats the American flag;

Whereas Minnesota produces and ships to eastern furnaces annually, close upon 30,000,000 tons of iron ore, which exceeds one-half of the iron-ore product of America and one-fourth that of the world, and whereas this iron ore should be converted into iron and steel by Minnesota labor on Minnesota soil for distribution throughout the Mississippi Valley and westward, and a great industrial plant for such purpose is now being established at Duluth;

Whereas Minnesota and the near-by upper Mississippi Valley States of Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, North and South Dakota annually produce about 300,000,000 bushels of wheat and 900,000,000 bushels of corn, oats, and other coarse grains, besides a vast tonnage of flour, lumber, live stock, and dairy products, much of which seeks transportation to the markets of the world; and

Whereas the Great Lakes system, which connects with the Atlantic seaboard, and the Mississippi River, which flows to the Gulf of Mexico, have their common source in Minnesota, the tributaries of the upper Mississippi extending within 50 miles of Lake Superior, and the union of the Great Lakes and Mississippi watersheds by canalization would make the greatest internal waterway of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That it is the sense of the legislature of Minnesota that the commerce of this great lake and river should be connected by a national waterway canal;

Resolved, That such waterway is of the greatest importance to this State and Nation, and we hereby pledge the cooperation of the Commonwealth of Minnesota with our Federal Government in the construction of such canal and in canalizing the upper Mississippi River;

Resolved further, That our delegation in Congress be, and is hereby, urged to impress upon Congress the necessity for immediate action in

constructing such canal, and that a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Senator and Representative from this State.

Adopted by the house of representatives March 11, 1909.

ARCHIBALD H. VERNON,
Chief Clerk.

Adopted by the senate March 16, 1909.

GEO. W. PEACHEY,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of granite companies of St. Cloud, Rockville, Granite City, and East St. Cloud, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on granite and granite products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WETMORE. I present a resolution of the legislature of Rhode Island, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January Session, A. D. 1909.

Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives in Congress to urge Congress to make an appropriation of \$40,000 to reimburse the State of Rhode Island and the town of New Shoreham for expenditures in opening, keeping, and protecting the breachway at Great Salt Pond, Block Island.

Whereas the town of New Shoreham has expended the sum of \$40,000 in causing the breachway or channel existing between the Great Salt Pond, in said town, and the sea to be opened and in keeping and protecting such breachway so opened in accordance with the provisions of chapter 1289 of the public laws, entitled "An act to encourage and protect the fishing industries of the State," passed by the general assembly at its January session, A. D. 1894, and chapter 1435 of the public laws, entitled "An act to complete and protect the breachway at Great Salt Pond, Block Island," passed by the general assembly at its January session, A. D. 1895; and

Whereas the sum of \$40,000 so expended by said town was borrowed by said town of New Shoreham from the State of Rhode Island upon the promissory notes of said town for the aggregate sum of \$40,000; and

Whereas the State of Rhode Island, by the resolution passed by the general assembly at its January session, A. D. 1908, canceled the indebtedness represented by notes for the sum of \$15,000 then past due and caused said notes for said sum of \$15,000 to be canceled and surrendered up to the town treasurer of the town of New Shoreham; and

Whereas by reason of the opening of said breachway or channel and the maintenance and protection of said breachway said Great Salt Pond has become an important national harbor of refuge for vessels engaged in the coasting trade and in the fishing industries of New England, and the expenditures made by the town of New Shoreham as aforesaid have inured to the advantage of the coastwise commerce of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this general assembly requests the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States to urge the appropriation by Congress of the sum of \$25,000 to reimburse the town of New Shoreham for the expenditures made by it in opening, keeping, and protecting said breachway, and the further sum of \$15,000 to reimburse the State of Rhode Island for the amount loaned upon the notes of the town of New Shoreham canceled by the State as aforesaid.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Providence, March 16, 1909.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true copy of the original resolution passed by the general assembly of the State of Rhode Island on the 16th day of March, A. D. 1909.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State aforesaid the date first above written.

[SEAL.]

CHARLES P. BENNETT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a petition of Local Lodge 7089, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Mitchell, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. CARTER. I present senate joint memorial No. 5 of the legislature of Montana, favoring the donation of 150,000 acres of public land to the state penitentiary of Montana, 150,000 acres in aid and on account of the state insane asylum, and 150,000 acres of public land in aid and on account of the state orphans' home. I ask that the joint memorial be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Territories.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 5.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas it was the manifest intention of Congress when the Territory of Montana was admitted into the Union as a State to set aside and donate public lands to aid in the establishment of all public institutions, following a long-established precedent; and

Whereas through oversight and inadvertence no donation was made on account of the state penitentiary, the state asylum for the insane, nor the orphans' home, as was the case in other States: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, petition and earnestly urge that there be set aside and donated out of and from the unappropriated lands of the United States lying and being within the borders of the State of Montana 150,000 acres in aid and on account of the state penitentiary of Montana, 150,000 acres in aid and on account of the

asylum for the insane, and 150,000 in aid and on account of the orphans' home: Be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, instructed to forthwith transmit copies of this memorial, properly authenticated, to the Secretary of the Interior and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.
W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 10, 1909.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, Governor.

Filed March 10, 1909, at 2 o'clock p. m.

A. N. YODER,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of Montana, ss:

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the senate joint memorial No. 5, enacted by the eleventh session of the legislative assembly of the State of Montana and approved by Edwin L. Norris on the 10th day of March, 1909.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State. Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 18th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

A. N. YODER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CARTER. I present senate concurrent resolution No. 1 of the legislature of Montana, praying for the improvement of the Missouri River, the Yellowstone River, or the Red River of the North.

I ask that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 1.

Whereas the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has asked that provision be made for \$500,000,000 to be expended for the development of the navigable waterways of the United States; and

Whereas it has been publicly announced by a high and well-informed official of the United States that a sum of about \$275,000,000 has already been appropriated and authorized to be expended upon works now undertaken and to be hereafter completed on the rivers and harbors of the United States; and

Whereas none of said \$275,000,000 is being expended on the 1,600 miles of the navigable Missouri River above Sioux City; and

Whereas the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors recommends the improvement of the Missouri River below Sioux City (which is concurred in by the United States engineers), and its estimate provides for the general improvement of the Missouri River below Sioux City, Iowa, of which sum \$2,000,000 is to be expended annually upon the Missouri River from Kansas City to St. Louis; and

Whereas no estimates have been made for the general improvement of the Missouri River above Sioux City, Iowa, or the Yellowstone River or the Red River of the North; and

Whereas no money is being expended nor has provision been made to expend any part of the aforementioned \$42,500,000 within the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana; and

Whereas the United States engineers' estimate, submitted to the Chief of Engineers and through him submitted to the present Congress, makes practically no provision for any expenditure for the improvement or snagging of the upper Missouri River above Sioux City or the Yellowstone River in North Dakota and Montana; and

Whereas commerce carried on these streams during the year 1908 in the localities mentioned exceeds that of the Missouri River below Sioux City: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That our Senators and Representative in Congress be requested to immediately obtain proper estimates through the War Department of the requirements for the permanent general improvement of the Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and Fort Benton, Mont., and the Yellowstone River between its mouth and Terry, Mont., and on the Red River of the North between Fargo, N. Dak., and the international boundary line, and for the specific improvement and the reversion of the river banks at several points, namely, in the vicinity of Judith, Frazier, and Mondak, Mont., and other places where caving banks menace river craft and destroy the channel; and that they be requested to obtain suitable appropriations from the present Congress wherewith to make these specific improvements promptly, and, in the event of there being no river and harbor bill, they be requested to secure adequate appropriations for these specific improvements through some other measure, so as to maintain the channel of these rivers for the purpose of protecting and providing for the present and continually increasing commerce thereon.

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representative in Congress.

W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.
W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 6, 1909.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, Governor.

Filed March 6, 1909, at 3.30 o'clock p. m.

A. N. YODER, Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of Montana, ss:

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate concurrent resolution No. 1, enacted by the eleventh session of the legislative assembly of the State of Montana and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 6th day of March, A. D. 1909.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State. Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 18th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

A. N. YODER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CARTER. I present senate joint resolution No. 6 of the legislature of Montana, praying for the establishment of a new division of the Railway Mail Service, to include the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana and the Territory of Alaska, to be known as "division No. 13." I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 6.

Whereas the present postal divisions of the Railway Mail Service now established in the Northwest are of that size that proper and convenient consideration can not be given to all of the territory, the same being composed of part of the eighth and part of the tenth Railway Mail Service divisions, the headquarters of the former being at San Francisco, Cal., and the latter at St. Paul, Minn.; and

Whereas it appears from all of the evidence at hand that it would be extremely desirable that a third division be formed of portions of the said two divisions, to wit, Alaska, Oregon, Idaho, Washington, and Montana, the same to constitute Railway Mail Service Division No. 13:

Therefore We, the senate (the house concurring), most earnestly and respectfully pray that an act of Congress be passed creating a new division of the Railway Mail Service, consisting of the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana and the Territory of Alaska; and

The secretary of state of Montana is hereby directed to send a copy of this petition to the Congress of the United States.

W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.
W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 6, 1909.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, Governor.

Filed March 6, 1909, at 3.30 o'clock p. m.

A. N. YODER, Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of Montana, ss:

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint resolution No. 6, enacted by the eleventh session of the legislative assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 6th day of March, 1909.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 19th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

A. N. YODER, Secretary of State.

Mr. CARTER. I present a senate substitute for house concurrent resolution No. 6, of the legislature of Montana, relating to the classification of the mineral lands within the land grant of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company. I ask that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate substitute for house concurrent resolution 6.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Whereas a bill was passed by Congress providing for the classification of the mineral lands in the Northern Pacific land grant, and where a classification was pretended to be made by certain officials known as "mineral-land commissioners;" and

Whereas investigation of the work of such mineral-land commissioners by special field officials of the Interior Department discloses the fact that said former so-called "mineral-land classification" was unscientific, worthless, and made without full knowledge of the lands within the Northern Pacific land grant, and to the detriment of the Government and public; and

Whereas such investigation has shown such pretended classification to be inaccurate and devoid of merit; and

Whereas as a result of an investigation by the Interior Department of less than 50 per cent of the complaints so far made nearly 20,000 acres of mineral land has been restored to the Government; and

Whereas a proper and just classification of the mineral land of Montana is of vital interest to the miners and prospectors of the State, and involves mineral lands of untold millions of value: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the legislative assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring). That we humbly petition and request of the National Congress that it pass an act providing for a just, honest, and thorough mineral reclassification of all lands of the State of Montana within the Northern Pacific land grant.

W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.
W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 4, 1909.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, Governor.

Filed March 4, 1909, at 11.05 o'clock p. m.

A. N. YODER, Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of Montana, ss:

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate substitute for house concurrent resolution No. 6, enacted by the eleventh session of the legislative assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 4th day of March, 1909.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 18th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

A. N. YODER, Secretary of State.

Mr. BRIGGS presented a petition of the Verona Chemical Company, of Newark, N. J., praying for an increase in the proposed duty on saccharine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Verona Chemical Company, of Newark, N. J., praying for an increase of the duty on vanillin, and that cloves be placed on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Campbell, Morrell & Co., of Passaic, N. J., praying that gypsum be placed on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the J. & S. S. Thompson Company, of Elizabeth, N. J., praying for the repeal of the tariff on crude gypsum rock, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Stengal & Rothschild, of Newark, N. J., praying that raw hides be placed on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Robertson Art Tile Company, of Trenton, N. J., praying for the retention of paragraph 83 of the proposed tariff law, relating to the duty on tiles, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of J. C. Mahlan, of Ridgewood, N. J., praying for the adoption of certain changes in Schedule G of the present tariff law relating to the duty on currants, dates, citron, almonds, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Richard Meyer, of New Durham, N. J., remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the duty on leather used in the manufacture of pianofortes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Local Lodge No. 340, International Association of Machinists, of Newark, N. J., remonstrating against the reduction of the duty on iron and steel, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of John H. Stoddart, general manager of the New York Underwriters' Agency, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the adoption of a federal inheritance tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURKETT presented a petition of sundry lithographers of Omaha, Nebr., praying for an increase of the import duty on lithographic products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DEPEW presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Gouverneur, N. Y., remonstrating against any reduction being made in the duty on paper, wood pulp, sulphite, and lumber, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Utica, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Adirondack Lumber Manufacturers and Shippers' Association, of Utica, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to insure the conservation of the Adirondack forest, which was referred to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources.

He also presented petition of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the imposition of a higher import duty on lithographic products, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented a memorial of the Menasha Paper Company, of Menasha; of the Grand Rapids Pulp and Paper Company; of the Nekoosa Edwards Paper Company, of Port Edwards; of the Nekoosa Edwards Paper Company, of Nekoosa; and of the Union Bag and Paper Company, of Kaukauna, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on print paper, wood pulp, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 665, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Marshfield, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of sundry lithographers of Wisconsin, praying for the imposition of a higher import duty on lithographic products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Prairie du Chien, Wis., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement and regulation of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Prairie du Chien, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 496) to amend an act approved January 5, 1905, entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross;" to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 497) to renew and extend certain letters patent; and

A bill (S. 498) to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 499) making appropriation for expenses incurred under the treaty of Washington;

A bill (S. 500) for the relief of George Q. Allen; and

A bill (S. 501) for the relief of Lucy L. Bane; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 502) to create in the War and Navy departments, respectively, a roll to be known as the "civil war officers' annuity honor roll," to authorize placing thereon, with pay, certain surviving officers who served in the Volunteer or Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the civil war and who are not now on the retired list of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 503) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Edward Callan;

A bill (S. 504) authorizing the President to transfer First Lieut. George G. Craig, Medical Reserve Corps, United States Army, to the Medical Corps, United States Army, and place him on the retired list; and

A bill (S. 505) to correct the military record of Andrew Edgar; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 506) for the relief of William Boldenweck, assistant treasurer of the United States at Chicago; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 507) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin E. Boyd;

A bill (S. 508) granting an increase of pension to George W. Clayton;

A bill (S. 509) granting an increase of pension to Asher M. Castle;

A bill (S. 510) granting an increase of pension to Marion Campbell;

A bill (S. 511) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin V. Carey;

A bill (S. 512) granting an increase of pension to James Clark;

A bill (S. 513) granting a pension to Charles Ames;

A bill (S. 514) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Arsnall;

A bill (S. 515) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ashton;

A bill (S. 516) granting an increase of pension to Ira Bacon;

A bill (S. 517) granting an increase of pension to Laban S. Babbitt;

A bill (S. 518) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Bayles;

A bill (S. 519) granting an increase of pension to Ira Bell;

A bill (S. 520) granting an increase of pension to William T. Coleman;

A bill (S. 521) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Doolittle;

A bill (S. 522) granting an increase of pension to William Donegan;

A bill (S. 523) granting a pension to John Donnelly; and

A bill (S. 524) granting an increase of pension to Aaron V. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 525) to amend the act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce;" to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 526) for the relief of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 527) for the erection of a statue to the memory of Gen. James Miller at Peterboro, N. H.; and

A bill (S. 528) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 529) to provide for a term of the circuit and district courts at Keene, N. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 530) to amend an act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, and the acts supplementary thereto,

so as to extend the benefits thereof to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 531) to further protect the public health, and imposing additional duties upon the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 532) to correct the military record of Mirrick R. Burgess; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENSON:

A bill (S. 533) for the erection of a public building at Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 534) granting a pension to John Sherwood;

A bill (S. 535) granting a pension to Olive L. Thew;

A bill (S. 536) granting a pension to Rose A. Rowell; and

A bill (S. 537) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wait (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOURNE:

A bill (S. 538) to amend sections 2586 and 2587 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the acts of April 25, 1882, and August 23, 1890, relating to collection districts in Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 539) to authorize the sale of certain lands belonging to the Indians on the Siletz Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 540) granting a pension to Susan E. Baker; and

A bill (S. 541) granting an increase of pension to William F. Hodges; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

A bill (S. 542) creating an additional division of the Railway Mail Service, with headquarters at Omaha, Nebr., and providing the necessary officials therefor; to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

A bill (S. 543) to amend section 15 of an act to amend the national banking laws, approved May 30, 1908; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 544) for the relief of the heirs of David W. Dodson, deceased; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 545) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Byers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 546) to correct the naval record of William Lewis Holland; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 547) granting an increase of pension to William P. Snowden;

A bill (S. 548) granting an increase of pension to Osmund Mikesell;

A bill (S. 549) granting an increase of pension to James Thompson;

A bill (S. 550) granting an increase of pension to Michael Denyant;

A bill (S. 551) granting an increase of pension to Asa J. Clothier;

A bill (S. 552) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Snowden;

A bill (S. 553) granting a pension to Catherine Kelly;

A bill (S. 554) granting an increase of pension to Otis B. Smith;

A bill (S. 555) granting a pension to Catherine Mastick;

A bill (S. 556) granting an increase of pension to William Kelley;

A bill (S. 557) granting an increase of pension to John M. Bayley;

A bill (S. 558) granting an increase of pension to Milton H. Bates;

A bill (S. 559) granting an increase of pension to William H. Covert;

A bill (S. 560) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Peters;

A bill (S. 561) granting an increase of pension to Reubin P. McCutchen (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 562) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Bailey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 563) granting a pension to Elizabeth S. Reed (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 564) granting a pension to Ida M. Smith; and

A bill (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to William C. Hudnall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 566) providing for the purchase of a painting of Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 567) increasing the pensions of army nurses; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRANE:

A bill (S. 568) granting an increase of pension to Otis T. Simonds; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 569) to pay Maj. Horace P. Williams amount found due him by Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PILES:

A bill (S. 570) granting an increase of pension to Cassle Thompson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNTER:

A bill (S. 571) granting a pension to Emma Coleman;

A bill (S. 572) granting a pension to William G. Mandeville; and

A bill (S. 573) granting a pension to Anna C. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 574) to authorize J. W. Vance, L. L. Allen, C. F. Helwig, and H. V. Worley, of Pierce City, Mo.; A. B. Durnil, D. H. Kemp, Sig Solomon, J. J. Davis, S. A. Chappell, and W. M. West, of Monett, Mo.; M. L. Coleman, M. T. Davis, Jared R. Woodfill, Jr., J. H. Jarrett, and William H. Standish, of Aurora, Lawrence County, Mo.; and L. S. Meyer, F. S. Heffernan, Robert A. Moore, William H. Johnson, J. P. McCammon, M. W. Colbaugh, and W. H. Schreiber, of Springfield, Greene County, Mo., to construct a dam across the James River, in Stone County, Mo., and to divert a portion of its waters through a tunnel into the said river again to create electric power; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CLAY:

A bill (S. 575) for the relief of Eugene J. O'Conner and J. B. Schweers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

A bill (S. 576) granting an increase of pension to Caloway G. Tucker; and

A bill (S. 577) granting a pension to Will H. Mullins; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 578) to erect a post-office building in the city of Morristown, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 579) to correct the lineal and relative rank of certain officers of the United States Army and to prevent the recurrence of like cases by amending the act approved October 1, 1890, entitled "An act to provide for the examination of certain officers of the army and to regulate promotion therein" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAYNER:

A bill (S. 580) for the relief of Samuel H. Walker; and

A bill (S. 581) to pay Leopold Luchs moneys laid out and expended by him in the improvement of a tract of ground in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 582) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Hedges;

A bill (S. 583) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Berryman;

A bill (S. 584) granting an increase of pension to John A. Clemans; and

A bill (S. 585) granting an increase of pension to William Runyan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 586) granting a pension to William S. Davidson;

A bill (S. 587) granting an increase of pension to Snyder D. Freeland;

A bill (S. 588) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Shepard;

A bill (S. 589) granting an increase of pension to Fidelana Whitehead;

A bill (S. 590) granting an increase of pension to David L. Smith;

A bill (S. 591) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Sager;

A bill (S. 592) granting a pension to C. A. Bills; and

A bill (S. 593) granting a pension to Sarah A. Waite; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

(By request) A bill (S. 594) for the relief of W. R. Trotter and others (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 595) for the relief of the estate of W. C. York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 596) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory

thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 597) reserving from entry and sale the mineral rights to coal and other minerals mined for fuel, oil, gas, or asphalt upon or underlying the public lands of the United States, and providing for the entry of the surface of public lands underlain with or containing coal or other minerals mined for fuel, oil, gas, or asphalt, and providing for the leasing of the mineral rights in such lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 598) providing for the valuation of the segregated coal and asphalt lands and the surplus lands in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations and of the surplus lands in the Creek Nation, in the State of Oklahoma, and for the sale of the surface and the disposition of the mineral rights therein; and

A bill (S. 599) providing for the valuation of the segregated coal and asphalt lands in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, in the State of Oklahoma, and for the sale of the surface and the disposition of the mineral rights therein; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRIGGS:

A bill (S. 600) appropriating \$10,000 to aid in the erection of a monument in memory of the late President James A. Garfield, at Long Branch, N. J.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 601) to provide for the government of the Canal Zone, the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

A bill (S. 602) granting an increase of pension to Joel N. Shelton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 603) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Statia (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 604) granting an increase of pension to Monroe Masterson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 605) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Buchman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT:

A bill (S. 606) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hall (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 607) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Fouce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 608) correcting the military records of Charles T. Gallagher and Samuel H. Proctor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 609) incorporating the National Institute of Arts and Letters; and

A bill (S. 610) incorporating the American Academy of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 611) to restore to the active list of the United States Navy the name of Commodore Charles Plummer Perkins, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 614) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Dewitt Eastman," approved January 8, 1909; and

A bill (S. 615) for the relief of Daniel Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 616) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896, relative to the expense allowance of United States attorneys and assistants while absent from their official residences on official business;

A bill (S. 617) to authorize the issuance of special bench warrants in certain criminal cases;

A bill (S. 618) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended by the act of February 5, 1903;

A bill (S. 619) to provide an additional circuit judge for the eighth circuit; and

A bill (S. 620) to regulate the judicial procedure of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 621) to amend sections 2325 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 622) to increase the limit of cost for the acquisition of additional land for the site of the new post-office and court-house at Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 623) authorizing national banking associations to make loans on real-estate security in certain cases; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 624) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of additional light-house districts," approved June 26, 1886; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 625) to amend an act entitled "An act to define and punish crimes in the district of Alaska, and to provide a code of criminal procedure for said district," approved March 3, 1899; and

A bill (S. 626) to amend the act of Congress approved March 3, 1903, entitled "An act to amend section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 14, 1898, entitled 'An act extending the homestead laws and providing for a right of way for railroads in the district of Alaska;'" to the Committee on Territories.

A bill (S. 627) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 628) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Barnard;

A bill (S. 629) granting an increase of pension to Laura M. Hoard;

A bill (S. 630) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Sanford;

A bill (S. 631) to amend the pension laws of the United States;

A bill (S. 632) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Decker;

A bill (S. 633) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Sloggy; and

A bill (S. 634) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Ingersoll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 635) for the relief of J. Blair Schoenfelt, former United States Indian agent, Union Agency, Okla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 636) making appropriation to defray expenses of delegates to the constitutional convention of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Territories.

A bill (S. 637) for the distribution of the funds of the Five Civilized Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 638) authorizing national banking associations to conform to state laws levying a tax or assessment to secure depositors; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 639) granting a pension to Noah E. Curtis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 640) authorizing the creation of a land district in the State of South Dakota to be known as the "Le Beau land district;" to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 641) extending the provisions of existing pension laws to the officers and privates, their widows, children, and dependent parents, of the "Dakota Militia of 1862 and 1863;"

A bill (S. 642) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, to the members of the company of Indian scouts under command of Brig. Gen. Alfred Sully in 1864 and 1865; and

A bill (S. 643) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Stanley; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 644) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to amend and further extend the benefits of the act approved February 8, 1887, entitled 'An act to provide for the allotment of land in severalty to Indians on the various reservations and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States over the Indians, and for other purposes;'" to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 645) for the relief of Arthur G. Fisk (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 646) for the relief of the estate of Julius Jacobs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE (by request):

A bill (S. 647) for the relief of Marion B. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 648) granting an increase of pension to George W. Peters;

A bill (S. 649) granting an increase of pension to George Pierce;

A bill (S. 650) granting a pension to Cook Gamble;

A bill (S. 651) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hayden; and

A bill (S. 652) granting increase of pensions to survivors of the Indian wars under the acts of July 27, 1892, and June 27, 1902; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 653) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, to enlarge the powers

of the Interstate Commerce Commission, approved June 20, 1906;" to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 654) granting an increase of pension to Charles Richter;

A bill (S. 655) granting a pension to Alma C. Maxey;

A bill (S. 656) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Hare;

A bill (S. 657) granting a pension to Emily A. Horsefield;

A bill (S. 658) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Robichaud;

A bill (S. 659) granting a pension to Regina Ebert;

A bill (S. 660) granting a pension to Julia Coolen;

A bill (S. 661) granting a pension to John Dillon;

A bill (S. 662) granting an increase of pension to Ezra R. Lathrop;

A bill (S. 663) granting an increase of pension to Merton Stancliff (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 664) granting an increase of pension to William Barlow (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 665) granting an increase of pension to Mitchell S. Barney (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 666) granting an increase of pension to Phillip Sutton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 667) granting an increase of pension to William D. Lovelace (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 668) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Enos (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 669) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Radcliff;

A bill (S. 670) granting an increase of pension to Ira T. Belden (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 671) granting an increase of pension to Parley S. McCracken;

A bill (S. 672) granting an increase of pension to Henry Mott;

A bill (S. 673) granting an increase of pension to William H. Jones (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 674) granting an increase of pension to Joshua B. Shumate;

A bill (S. 675) granting an increase of pension to Young S. Slater;

A bill (S. 676) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Kindt (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 677) granting an increase of pension to George D. Anderson;

A bill (S. 678) granting an increase of pension to J. C. Milton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 679) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Golden (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 680) granting an increase of pension to Harrison L. McGinness;

A bill (S. 681) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. O'Donnell;

A bill (S. 682) granting an increase of pension to John W. McDaniels;

A bill (S. 683) granting an increase of pension to William H. Scott;

A bill (S. 684) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Martin;

A bill (S. 685) granting a pension to Annie E. Shout (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 686) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Suess.

A bill (S. 687) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Gibbons;

A bill (S. 688) granting an increase of pension to W. M. Nace;

A bill (S. 689) granting an increase of pension to Armstead Fletcher;

A bill (S. 690) granting an increase of pension to Eli Lewis;

A bill (S. 691) granting an increase of pension to Elol J. Hotton;

A bill (S. 692) granting an increase of pension to Hiram D. Brown;

A bill (S. 693) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Emert;

A bill (S. 694) granting an increase of pension to Josiah C. Ury;

A bill (S. 695) granting an increase of pension to F. M. Ricards;

A bill (S. 696) granting a pension to Terressa Jane Hoyt (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 697) granting an increase of pension to Simon B. Madden;

A bill (S. 698) granting an increase of pension to William E. Puett;
 A bill (S. 699) granting an increase of pension to Harry E. Wagner;
 A bill (S. 700) granting a pension to Catherine Madden;
 A bill (S. 701) granting an increase of pension to Lyman Aldrich;
 A bill (S. 702) granting an increase of pension to John L. Langdon;
 A bill (S. 703) granting a pension to Mrs. John S. Brannan;
 A bill (S. 704) granting a pension to A. C. Constant;
 A bill (S. 705) granting an increase of pension to H. Clay Harman;
 A bill (S. 706) granting a pension to Purdis Ludington;
 A bill (S. 707) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin McElroy;
 A bill (S. 708) granting an increase of pension to George E. Ray;
 A bill (S. 709) granting a pension to Eliza P. Tagart;
 A bill (S. 710) granting a pension to Alexander R. Banks;
 A bill (S. 711) granting an increase of pension to Richard Burnside;
 A bill (S. 712) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Bartlett;
 A bill (S. 713) granting a pension to Nancy L. Flew;
 A bill (S. 714) granting an increase of pension to F. B. Fritz;
 A bill (S. 715) granting an increase of pension to Charles Dreyer;
 A bill (S. 716) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Wilcox;
 A bill (S. 717) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. White;
 A bill (S. 718) granting an increase of pension to Charles Williams;
 A bill (S. 719) granting an increase of pension to Norman A. Rupe (with an accompanying paper);
 A bill (S. 720) granting an increase of pension to A. F. Wade;
 A bill (S. 721) granting an increase of pension to John W. Riffe;
 A bill (S. 722) granting an increase of pension to James M. Stanley;
 A bill (S. 723) granting an increase of pension to George W. James;
 A bill (S. 724) granting an increase of pension to Nat G. Buster;
 A bill (S. 725) granting a pension to Emilie J. Raff;
 A bill (S. 726) granting an increase of pension to John Brannan;
 A bill (S. 727) granting an increase of pension to Almon Sparling;
 A bill (S. 728) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Hemmant (with accompanying papers); and
 A bill (S. 729) granting an increase of pension to Jesse F. Snow (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. BURTON:
 A bill (S. 730) for the relief of the several States under the act of July 8, 1898, and acts amendatory thereto; and
 A bill (S. 731) for the relief of Mary Sherman McCallum; to the Committee on Claims.
 A bill (S. 732) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth P. Boggis;
 A bill (S. 733) granting an increase of pension to A. H. Bash;
 A bill (S. 734) granting an increase of pension to Edmund B. Updegrave;
 A bill (S. 735) granting an increase of pension to Charles Reader;
 A bill (S. 736) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Graham;
 A bill (S. 737) granting a pension to Charles Keyerleber;
 A bill (S. 738) granting an increase of pension to William D. Parlin;
 A bill (S. 739) granting an increase of pension to John M. Fitzpatrick;
 A bill (S. 740) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Bradley;
 A bill (S. 741) granting an increase of pension to Charles Davis; and
 A bill (S. 742) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Mulhall; to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. BURNHAM:
 A bill (S. 743) granting a pension to Verona Harriman;
 A bill (S. 744) granting an increase of pension to John B. Holt;

A bill (S. 745) granting an increase of pension to Augustus P. Horne;
 A bill (S. 746) granting an increase of pension to Merrill Johnson;
 A bill (S. 747) granting an increase of pension to John H. Johonnett;
 A bill (S. 748) granting an increase of pension to Dana H. McDuffee;
 A bill (S. 749) granting an increase of pension to Ransom Manning;
 A bill (S. 750) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Mansfield;
 A bill (S. 751) granting an increase of pension to Hosea Q. Mason;
 A bill (S. 752) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Perley; and
 A bill (S. 753) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Perry; to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. SUTHERLAND:
 A bill (S. 754) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Wilcox;
 A bill (S. 755) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Charter;
 A bill (S. 756) granting an increase of pension to George W. Muncy;
 A bill (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Kerns;
 A bill (S. 758) granting a pension to Samuel Garn;
 A bill (S. 759) granting a pension to Persis M. McKee; and
 A bill (S. 760) granting a pension to A. J. Staley; to the Committee on Pensions.
 By Mr. WARNER:
 A bill (S. 761) granting an increase of pension to John R. Wilson;
 A bill (S. 762) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bird;
 A bill (S. 763) granting an increase of pension to James M. Silvers;
 A bill (S. 764) granting an increase of pension to Dollie Taylor;
 A bill (S. 765) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wrigley;
 A bill (S. 766) granting an increase of pension to Allen Davis;
 A bill (S. 767) granting a pension to Catherine Wagener;
 A bill (S. 768) granting a pension to Jacob Scott;
 A bill (S. 769) granting a pension to George W. Morgan;
 A bill (S. 770) granting a pension to Thomas Seal;
 A bill (S. 771) granting a pension to James N. Snodgrass;
 A bill (S. 772) granting an increase of pension to George T. Hayes;
 A bill (S. 773) granting an increase of pension to William H. Howell;
 A bill (S. 774) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Douglas;
 A bill (S. 775) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. White;
 A bill (S. 776) granting an increase of pension to Charles Muhlbach;
 A bill (S. 777) granting an increase of pension to Austin Shinn;
 A bill (S. 778) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Mitchell;
 A bill (S. 779) granting an increase of pension to John H. Morrison;
 A bill (S. 780) granting an increase of pension to David F. Johnson;
 A bill (S. 781) granting an increase of pension to James Robinson;
 A bill (S. 782) granting an increase of pension to Albert Slates;
 A bill (S. 783) granting an increase of pension to John H. Poynter;
 A bill (S. 784) granting an increase of pension to James M. Beal;
 A bill (S. 785) granting an increase of pension to Collins South;
 A bill (S. 786) granting a pension to Mary E. Williams;
 A bill (S. 787) granting a pension to Mary Riffe;
 A bill (S. 788) granting an increase of pension to Simeon Lesley;
 A bill (S. 789) granting an increase of pension to Simeon K. Howe;
 A bill (S. 790) granting an increase of pension to William S. Woodford;

A bill (S. 791) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Yoachum;
 A bill (S. 792) granting a pension to Robert F. Jones;
 A bill (S. 793) granting a pension to Sudie Hopkins;
 A bill (S. 794) granting a pension to James A. Church;
 A bill (S. 795) granting an increase of pension to Jerome N. Gesnier;
 A bill (S. 796) granting a pension to Michael Champlain;
 A bill (S. 797) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wade;
 A bill (S. 798) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Collins;
 A bill (S. 799) granting an increase of pension to Josiah U. Luyster;
 A bill (S. 800) granting an increase of pension to Lee W. Putnam;
 A bill (S. 801) granting an increase of pension to John Dixon;
 A bill (S. 802) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester M. Johnson;
 A bill (S. 803) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus Bishop;
 A bill (S. 804) granting a pension to John F. Mitchell;
 A bill (S. 805) granting a pension to Joseph B. Harriford;
 A bill (S. 806) granting a pension to James P. Hopkins;
 A bill (S. 807) granting a pension to Joseph K. Boone;
 A bill (S. 808) granting an increase of pension to John P. Todhunter;
 A bill (S. 809) granting a pension to William H. Thomas;
 A bill (S. 810) granting a pension to John H. Priestley;
 A bill (S. 811) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Wethers;
 A bill (S. 812) granting an increase of pension to Herman Schubert;
 A bill (S. 813) granting a pension to Herman Ruch; and
 A bill (S. 814) to amend section No. 3 of an act entitled "An act in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents,' approved June 27, 1890," approved May 9, 1900; to the Committee on Pensions.
 A bill (S. 815) for the relief of Sanger & Moody; to the Committee on Claims.
 A bill (S. 816) to prevent the desecration of the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary;
 A bill (S. 817) for the relief of Jacob John Locher;
 A bill (S. 818) to empower the Secretary of War to allow burial of wives of deceased enlisted men in national cemeteries in the same graves as deceased soldiers; and
 A bill (S. 819) to correct the military record of Rudolph Kraut; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
 By Mr. NELSON:
 A joint resolution (S. J. R. 6) authorizing the Secretary of War to award the congressional medal of honor to Guy C. Pierce and Thomas H. Nolan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
 By Mr. GORE:
 A joint resolution (S. J. R. 7) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; and
 A joint resolution (S. J. R. 8) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the levy and collection of an income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

LODE CLAIMS IN ALASKA.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 612) to modify the law pertaining to the acquisition and holding of lode claims in the district of Alaska, which was read twice by its title.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. KEAN. As I heard the title of the bill read it is in regard to Alaska, and it was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, whereas it ought to go to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I somewhat doubt the judgment of the Senator as to that. It seems that it is a bill in regard to mines, and it should go to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. KEAN. The Committee on Territories has entire charge of all business relating to Alaska.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That does not make any difference. I can see no more reason why this bill should go to the Committee on Territories than one relating to mines in New Mexico.

Mr. KEAN. I will only say to the Senator that it has been the custom to send all such bills to the Committee on Territories. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Territories.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair had referred the bill to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. KEAN. I ask that the reference be changed to the Committee on Territories.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey asks that the bill be referred to the Committee on Territories. Is there objection?

Mr. DICK. Mr. President, I desire to lodge an objection against the request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made; and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

CONSERVATION OF TIMBER RESOURCES.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 613) relating to the conservation of the timber resources of the United States, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The bill appears to have been referred, by request of the Senator from Minnesota, to the Committee on Public Lands, whereas it would seem by its title to belong to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources. At least it would seem that if such a bill does not belong to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources, that committee would look in vain for any tangible jurisdiction.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. At the request of the Senator from Minnesota the bill was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the bill involves the disposition of public lands. It was before the Committee on Public Lands at the last session, and I think it should now go to that committee, as it relates to the method of disposing of our public lands.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Very well.

TAXATION OF REAL ESTATE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask leave to withdraw the bill (S. 114) taxing real estate in the District of Columbia, which was introduced by me by mistake.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No objection is heard, and the bill is withdrawn.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$80,000 for the purchase, condemnation, or otherwise of land desirable for a new site for the post-office and courthouse at Duluth, Minn., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to furnishing meals and lodging for jurors in certain cases, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that hereafter the judges of the district courts of the United States shall be allowed the sum of \$6 per day as expenses for traveling, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

COFFEE TRADE WITH CUBA.

Mr. DEPEW. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 8) was read, as follows:

Senate resolution 8.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to transmit to the Senate of the United States all papers and correspondence between the Department of State and the Republic of Cuba in connection with the question of recognizing coffee roasted in the United States and exported to the Republic of Cuba, as being a product of the industry of the United States, so far as consistent with the public interests.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask that the resolution be read again. It does not seem to be in accordance with the general practice.

Mr. DEPEW. I think it better that the resolution should go to the Committee on Cuban Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Cuban Relations. No objection is heard.

MAJ. PIERRE CHARLES L'ENFANT.

Mr. RAYNER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. C. Res. 2), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Senate concurrent resolution 2.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby granted the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol on the occasion of the removal of the remains of Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant from the present resting place, the Digges farm, in Prince George County, Md., to Arlington

National Cemetery, where the remains will be reinterred; such use of the Rotunda to be for a part of one day, and to be on such day, and under such supervision as may be approved by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CRANE subsequently, from the Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the foregoing concurrent resolution, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 7), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 7.

Resolved, That the Committee on the University of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of \$1,440 per annum.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 11.

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

PRINTING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 9) was read, as follows:

Senate resolution 9.

Resolved, That authority is granted to print and bind, for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, such papers and documents as may be deemed necessary in connection with subjects heretofore considered or to be considered by said committee during the Sixty-first Congress.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KEAN. What is the resolution?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is the usual printing resolution.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if, under the rules, the resolution ought not to go to the Committee on Printing, to examine into the probable cost of the proposed printing?

Mr. GALLINGER. The cost could not possibly be ascertained. Similar resolutions have been passed during the last five Congresses. The Committee on the District of Columbia has hearings from time to time, and the committee wishes the privilege of printing those hearings. It is an inconsequential matter. The committee has been in the habit of doing it for a long time.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is the customary resolution?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; it is the customary resolution.

Mr. CULBERSON. Under the circumstances I shall not object, but I understand the rule to be that if the cost of printing exceeds \$500 the resolution must go to the Committee on Printing or to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that the printing under the resolution will cost very much less than that; and in the very nature of things we could not anticipate the exact cost.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator is sure, however, that the cost of printing will be less than \$500?

Mr. GALLINGER. I certainly can give the Senator that assurance.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very well; then it is within the rule.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

EDWARD A. KEELER.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 10), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 10.

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate is hereby directed to place the name of Edward A. Keeler on the employees' roll of the Senate, to date from and after the passage of this resolution, at the rate of \$1,440 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate pending further provision by law, and that such employment be continued until otherwise ordered by the Senate.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate concurrent resolution 12 from the House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 12.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That during the present session of Congress there shall be printed and allotted for distribution to each Member of the House of Representatives 40 copies and to each Senator 60 copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in addition to the number now provided by law, but no portion of said additional quota shall be reserved for binding.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 29, 1909, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 25, 1909.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Ormsby McHarg, of North Dakota, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor, vice William R. Wheeler, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles A. Judson, of Ohio, to be collector of customs for the district of Sandusky, in the State of Ohio. To fill an existing vacancy.

AMBASSADOR TO ITALY.

John G. A. Leishman, of Pennsylvania, now ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Turkey, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy, vice Lloyd C. Griscom, resigned.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Henry Clay Ide, of Vermont, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain, vice William Miller Collier, resigned.

Charles H. Sherrill, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Argentine Republic, vice Huntington Wilson, appointed Assistant Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

Thomas R. Lyons, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, first division, district of Alaska, vice Royal A. Gunnison, whose term expired December 11, 1908.

Charles P. Orr, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge, western district of Pennsylvania. An additional appointment, authorized by the act of Congress approved February 26, 1909.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Cornelius D. Murane, of Alaska, to be United States attorney, third division, district of Alaska, commencing July 1, 1909, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1909 (Public, No. 322).

George B. Curtiss, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York. A reappointment, his term having expired on June 4, 1908.

Henry A. Wise, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Henry L. Stimson, resigned.

William G. Wheeler, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin. A reappointment, his term having expired January 22, 1909.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Levi P. Hunt, Second Cavalry, to be colonel from March 23, 1909, vice Hickey, Fourteenth Cavalry, retired from active service.

Maj. Edwin P. Andrus, Third Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel from March 23, 1909, vice Hunt, Second Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Daniel L. Tate, Third Cavalry, to be major from March 23, 1909, vice Andrus, Third Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. William H. Winters, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be captain from March 23, 1909, vice Tate, Third Cavalry, promoted.

INFANTRY ARM.

Capt. Walter H. Gordon, Eighteenth Infantry, to be major from March 23, 1909, vice Browne, Second Infantry, deceased.

Second Lieut. John McE. Pruyn, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from December 2, 1908, vice Hawkins, Twenty-seventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Henry W. Fleet, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant from December 9, 1908, vice Hegeman, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Francis H. Burr, Third Infantry, to be first lieutenant from December 11, 1908, vice Tarlton, First Infantry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. John C. Ashburn, Fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from December 24, 1908, vice Hadsell, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert T. Phinney, Twelfth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from February 28, 1909, vice Feeter, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Hugh M. Kelly, Twenty-sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 6, 1909, vice Rains, Twentieth Infantry, dropped for desertion.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Richard T. Mulligan to be a captain in the navy from the 11th day of March, 1909, vice Capt. Albert F. Dixon, deceased.

Lieut. Commander William H. G. Bullard to be a commander in the navy from the 25th day of February, 1909, vice Commander Henry C. Gearing, retired.

Ensign Darrell P. Wickersham to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the navy from the 2d day of February, 1909, upon the completion of three years' service in present grade.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Darrell P. Wickersham to be a lieutenant in the navy from the 2d day of February, 1909, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

CHIEF JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF PORTO RICO.

José Conrado Hernandez, of Porto Rico, to be chief justice of the supreme court of Porto Rico, vice José Severo Quinones, deceased.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF PORTO RICO.

Emilio Toro y Cuevas, of Porto Rico, to be associate justice of the supreme court of Porto Rico, vice José Conrado Hernandez, nominated to be chief justice.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

John W. Miller, of Wisconsin, to be register of the land office at Wausau, Wis., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Minor S. Williams, of Minot, N. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Williston, N. Dak., vice Victor Chaffee, deceased, and John P. McDowell, temporary appointee.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Newman H. Freeman to be postmaster at Haleyville (late Haleysville), Ala. Office became presidential January 1, 1909, and to change name of office.

ILLINOIS.

William D. Hardy to be postmaster at Taylorville, Ill., in place of James R. Smith, resigned.

IOWA.

J. W. Jarnagin to be postmaster at Cedar Falls, Iowa, in place of Edward A. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1907.

KANSAS.

Robert H. Montgomery to be postmaster at Oswego, Kans., in place of Jared C. Richcreek. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1908.

KENTUCKY.

Mike Hughes to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Ky., in place of Ludlow F. Petty, resigned.

MARYLAND.

William P. Miller to be postmaster at Forest Glen, Md. Office became presidential January 1, 1908.

MICHIGAN.

Cash B. Herman to be postmaster at Carleton, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1908.

MISSOURI.

Robert A. Booth to be postmaster at Buffalo, Mo., in place of Robert A. Booth. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1908.

Alexander T. Boothe to be postmaster at Pierce City, Mo., in place of Alexander T. Boothe. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1909.

James F. Rhea to be postmaster at Dixon, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1908.

NEBRASKA.

Lon Cone to be postmaster at McCook, Nebr., in place of Stuart B. McLean, deceased.

NEW JERSEY.

Herbert C. Farrand to be postmaster at Bloomfield, N. J., in place of George W. Heath, resigned.

NEW YORK.

Herbert B. Eaton to be postmaster at Youngstown, N. Y., in place of Herbert B. Eaton. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1909.

Archibald K. Fowler to be postmaster at Caledonia, N. Y., in place of Archibald K. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1909.

Frederick S. Welch to be postmaster at Allegany, N. Y., in place of Henry E. Harms. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1908.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Jesse C. Randall to be postmaster at Bryson City, N. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1908.

OHIO.

Charles M. Trace to be postmaster at New Concord, Ohio, in place of George C. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1909.

OKLAHOMA.

John Coyle to be postmaster at Rush Springs, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1908.

G. L. Hamrick to be postmaster at Tuttle, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Thomas F. Bourke to be postmaster at Rossiter, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1908.

James Edward Butler to be postmaster at Ellwood City, Pa., in place of Robert A. Todd. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1909.

John B. Cox to be postmaster at Sheridanville, Pa., in place of Charles Wolfenden, resigned.

Joseph A. McClaran to be postmaster at Saltsburg, Pa., in place of Joseph A. McClaran. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1909.

David I. Stadden to be postmaster at Glen Campbell, Pa., in place of David I. Stadden. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1909.

James R. Underwood to be postmaster at Roscoe, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1908.

VIRGINIA.

Albert A. Evans to be postmaster at Mount Jackson, Va., in place of Albert A. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1909.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25, 1909.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Ormsby McHarg to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Minor S. Williams to be receiver of public moneys at Williston, N. Dak.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Charles M. Tozer to be a lieutenant-commander.

Lieut. Leigh C. Palmer to be a lieutenant-commander.

The following-named lieutenant-commanders to be lieutenant-commanders:

Thomas D. Parker,

Jonas H. Holden,

Thomas T. Craven,

Daniel W. Wurtsbaugh,

Gatewood S. Lincoln,

Ivan C. Wettengel,

Wat T. Cluverius,

Albert W. Marshall,
Thomas A. Kearney,
Arthur MacArthur, jr., and
Frank E. Ridgely.

Lieut. Commander Robert E. Coontz to be a commander.
The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Andrew C. Pickens,
Paul P. Blackburn,
Forde A. Todd, and
Allen B. Reed.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Andrew C. Pickens,
Paul P. Blackburn,
Forde A. Todd, and
Allen B. Reed.

Midshipman Joseph S. Evans to be an ensign.

The following-named paymasters, with the rank of lieutenant, to be paymasters, with the rank of lieutenant-commander:

Timothy S. O'Leary,
George Brown, jr.,
Walter B. Izard,
David Potter,
Samuel Bryan,
Arthur F. Huntington,
Harry H. Balthis,
Charles Conrad,
William T. Gray,
George P. Dyer,
John W. Morse,
Robert H. Woods,
Robert H. Orr,
William A. Merritt,
John Irwin, jr.,
Webb V. H. Rose,
William H. Doherty,
Charles Morris, jr.,
Frederick K. Perkins, and
George C. Schafer.

The following-named assistant paymasters, with the rank of ensign, to be assistant paymasters, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

Dallas B. Wainwright, jr.,
William H. Wilterdink,
George P. Shamer,
Harry H. Palmer,
Omar D. Conger,
John F. O'Mara,
Patrick T. M. Lathrop,
James P. Helm,
Byron D. Rogers,
Edward C. Little,
Frank H. Atkinson,
Frank Baldwin,
Manning H. Philbrick, and
Henry L. Beach.

Naval Constructor Richard H. Robinson, with the rank of lieutenant, to be a naval constructor with the rank of lieutenant-commander.

The following-named assistant naval constructors, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to be assistant naval constructors with the rank of lieutenant:

Fred G. Coburn,
Waldo P. Druley,
John E. Otterson,
Charles A. Harrington,
Herbert S. Howard,
Robert B. Hilliard, and
Edwin O. Fitch, jr.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Alice B. Bussey at Cuthbert, Ga.

ILLINOIS.

William D. Hardy at Taylorville, Ill.

KANSAS.

Charles K. Ware at Downs, Kans.

NEW YORK.

Edward Sautter at Lyons, N. Y.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John Cuncannon at Kennett Square, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, March 25, 1909.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 1438.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1438, the tariff bill, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized concerning a matter which is somewhat of personal privilege, and yet is of a public nature.

The newspapers of the country have made many statements in the last two days that I was engaged in the preparation of a bill for an income tax to carry out the policy of the administration of President Taft and that the President had given his official indorsement to such a measure. That is entirely wrong; and if allowed to go without immediate correction, it might lead to some possible embarrassment, or at least misunderstanding, as to the President and to his administration. So, under the circumstances, I desire to place on record exactly what has occurred and the purpose of it, and to place upon myself the entire responsibility for any measure which may be presented, and for that reason will ask about five minutes of the time of this committee.

When the National River and Harbor Congress met in Washington last December and resolved in favor of a large bond issue of \$500,000,000 for internal improvements, it seemed to me, as to many other Members of this House, that such a resolution in favor of a bond issue for such purposes was extremely unwise and dangerous, would imperil the national credit, and thus weaken the Nation as against possible future emergencies, and at the same time lead to needless and untold waste and extravagance. At the same time I realized the necessity, as I think we all do, that these great internal improvements must be made and properly provided for in some way, and some adequate way, too, which will satisfy the reasonable demands of the people that the waterways of the country will be speedily and well provided for. I think most of us also realize that the time is rapidly approaching when this Federal Government can no longer expect to derive its full income to defray the vast expenses of carrying on its varied operations entirely from the consuming capacity of the people. There must be some other method of raising revenue to care for the present and increasing future for carrying on the great purposes of the Federal Government. That seems to be recognized, in part, by the measure now before us for consideration.

The decision of Pollock against The Trust Company as to the income tax in the revenue act of 1894 has never been thoroughly satisfactory to the country. In the first case, in the One hundred and fifty-seventh United States, there were five points as to this law considered by the court. I shall not attempt to elaborate, but just to state what has actually occurred. There were two points actually decided in the first case as reported. One was that the tax on incomes from real estate was a direct tax; second, that under the Constitution Congress has no right to levy on the sovereign power of the States and tax the securities of States and their creatures—the municipalities.

In that decision there were three points expressly left undecided by the Supreme Court: First, whether or not these were separable from the other clauses of that law; second, whether or not the tax on personalty was a direct tax; third, the question of uniformity.

Upon the rehearing of this case, as reported in the One hundred and fifty-eighth United States, the court decided the invalid could not be separated from the valid portions of the law, so that all must fail. It further held that taxes on incomes from both real estate and personalty were direct taxes and so were invalid in that act. The question of uniformity was left undecided. So the law was decided to be unconstitutional for the foregoing reasons, which have dried up the sources of revenue from the great mass of concentrated wealth of the Nation best able to contribute to its maintenance and advancement.

Now, assuming that we need a largely increased revenue for the purpose of internal improvements; and, second, that the Federal Government ought to have the power to levy on the income of the aggregate wealth of this Nation; and, third, that

this ought to be provided so that the Government could use it in case of any emergency, it seemed to me that these could all be combined at this time and not interfere with any legislation at all or with improvements at all. The river and harbor bill, then pending and since passed, provided only for surveys, and made no appropriations for purposes of actual improvement. Before those surveys could eventuate into projects and require appropriations by Congress, this matter of providing revenues in this manner might be thoroughly and completely tested and argued and settled. For that purpose, it seemed to me, it might be good policy to have drafted the best kind of a bill, providing for a tax on incomes—an ideal bill, not having any connection with or designed to care for the current revenues or expenses of the Government at all—and place the proceeds of this tax, a small tax designed practically or principally for the purpose of testing these questions, into a special fund for internal waterway improvements. This tax or fund would not be the sole and exclusive fund for such purpose, but mostly a convenient method of framing the law and trying the case.

Now, if the tax be decided to be unconstitutional, and Congress has no power to make it, then no harm is done, no fund is impaired and no project uncared for, no bills unpaid, and credit of the Government would be just as high. The improvements would go along just the same. The matter by this means would be thoroughly and satisfactorily sifted and settled. The question then would be squarely presented to the American people, whether they thought that the Congress should have the power to levy such a tax, and if so, it must be done by means of a properly drafted constitutional amendment. Now, if the tax could be upheld, in whole or in substantial part, then the question of obtaining a fund for internal waterway improvements and, indeed, many other things would be settled. No bond issue would be necessary, and the power of the Government to levy on the aggregate wealth of this country in case of emergency would be completely disposed of. The credit of the Nation would be maintained, and a sentiment created that there would be a more equal distribution of its burdens.

For that reason it seemed to me to be wise to draft a bill with separate clauses, putting a tax upon incomes of real estate in one clause and declaring that the invalidity of that clause should not affect the balance of the provisions of the act. The same could be done as to personalty, and so on, as to the various classes and subjects of taxation. By this method any tax of any substance might be retained, even if some be found to be invalid upon the final consideration. Upon arriving at that conclusion I laid the matter before President Roosevelt. He was delighted with the suggestion and inquired in what way he could be of assistance. He referred me to the Secretary of the Treasury, who also gladly promised cooperation. The Secretary directed his subordinate officers to prepare a bill along those lines, but for some reason or other those officers neglected to do so and did not report their negligence until the very last week of last session. We were all rushed in the last days of the session, so I concluded to wait until the new administration came in.

I laid this matter before President Taft as I am explaining it to the House, and he also was pleased at the suggestion and promised cooperation to see that a bill was prepared as a basis for my own suggestions. The administration assumed no responsibility and the administration had no views in connection with the matter. All it did was to tender the services of the executive departments to do the work for this measure, exactly as it does for nearly every measure of importance presented to the House. And that is what I desire to have made clear, that whatever I do is on my own responsibility. I am only seeking advice and assistance from the various bureaus in the department of the administration and from whatever source I can get it. I will now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I see that the gentleman has made considerable investigation of this subject, and I desire to ask him whether or not, in his judgment, it would be impossible to frame a just, equitable, and comprehensive income-tax law without first securing a revision by the Supreme Court and a reversal by that court of the decision upon the income-tax question in 1894?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. No, Mr. Chairman; I do not quite agree with the gentleman. As I stated, there were three questions that the Supreme Court expressly refused to decide.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Will the gentleman pardon me in that connection?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. The first decision of the Supreme Court on this question is reported in the One hundred and fifty-

seventh United States Reports. That decided only a portion of the questions raised. In that case the chief questions decided related to incomes derived from real estate and also incomes derived from state or municipal bonds. That decision left undecided and open the question as to whether the void provisions in the bill rendered invalid the remainder of the provisions in the bill, whether an income from personal property was a direct tax, and also whether any part of the tax, if not direct, was invalid for want of uniformity. Those questions were left undetermined in the first decision. Later, when the hearing was had before the full court and the case was heard anew upon all the questions involved, a broad, sweeping decision was rendered by the Supreme Court, reported in the One hundred and fifty-eighth United States, undertaking to settle all the questions, and did so.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. The gentleman is entirely correct, and I will add the substance of that decision which, inadvertently, I overlooked.

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would like to ask him if he thinks the tax upon receipts of corporations would be in violation of the Constitution?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I prefer not to go into a discussion of that question. I am glad that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] has made the statement. I intended to supplement my first statement by an additional one as to the effect of the last decision, but it slipped my mind as I completed the analysis of the first decision.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Speaking accurately, it will not do to say that the first case of Pollock against The Insurance Company in the One hundred and fifty-seventh United States Reports was a decision. It was not a decision; it was simply the opinions of various judges. There was no decision of any of the questions raised until the decision was promulgated in the One hundred and fifty-eighth United States, when the full court was hearing the case and when Judge Jackson came back and took part, and then it was that the decision was rendered by a majority of five judges to four. So that we can not be guided by anything decided in the One hundred and fifty-seventh United States Reports. What was decided in the One hundred and fifty-eighth is a decision, but the case in the One hundred and fifty-seventh was not a decision.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I might differ slightly with the gentleman from Georgia, and yet he is correct, as he nearly always is upon legal propositions, that the final decision was that in the One hundred and fifty-eighth United States. However, that is not what I rose to present to this committee. The reasoning and arguments as to our powers are presented in both cases and have a bearing upon our actions, and all I want is to have made clear that whatever I am doing personally is upon my own responsibility, with the help of whatever sources of information I can draw from, and I propose to present some kind of a measure to this Congress before the close of this session.

Mr. PARSONS. But, as I understand the gentleman, it has nothing to do with the tariff bill.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Not at all; it has no connection with any pending measure. I have tried carefully to separate it from every legislative and administrative proposition.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I gather from the statement of the gentleman that the proceeds of the income tax which he proposes is to be used for the development of waterways.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. That is the nominal purpose, for the purpose of testing the question in a convenient manner, so that it shall not affect any pending legislation concerning our revenue.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is not that directly in conflict with the suggestion and the proposition made in every one of these large waterways conventions that have been held here at Washington by the people advocating the issuance of \$500,000,000 worth of bonds? Do not they claim that that is making posterity bear a part of the burdens? The gentleman's proposition is to bring the proceeds of his proposed income bill directly and immediately as a burden upon the people at this time. Does the gentleman intend that his income tax shall have any connection whatsoever with the clause in the present proposed tariff bill concerning the inheritance tax? It has no connection with that.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. There is no necessary connection at all. There can not be any connection, direct or remote, with any item of the measure.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does not the gentleman think that his suggestion would be a very fine substitute for the inheritance clause in the present tariff bill?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Not at all. The inheritance clause is there to raise a revenue. The suggestion I make is not.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does not the gentleman think the income tax would be more satisfactory and equitable than an inheritance tax?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. If the income tax could be collected to raise revenue for current expenses, but it can not. It will have to be tested by the best kind of a bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That could be tested in the tariff bill as well as in any other.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I do not care to enter into that discussion at this time.

Mr. JAMES. If I understand the gentleman correctly, his purpose is to have a bill prepared to be presented to the next session of Congress?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I should present it to this session.

Mr. JAMES. Does the gentleman expect to have it acted upon at this session?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I do not say that. I present it for discussion.

Mr. JAMES. Why not present it as an amendment to this bill?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Because it has an entirely different purpose. The bill I propose to present is for the purpose of having tested the right to levy those taxes.

Mr. JAMES. The purpose is to raise a revenue.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Yes; but I do not care to embarrass this bill in the slightest.

Mr. JAMES. Is it an embarrassment to this bill to offer to try to tax the wealth of the country to some extent?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. No; because I believe in that more thoroughly than the gentleman, but I am trying to do it in a practical way.

Mr. JAMES. I doubt if the gentleman believes in it more thoroughly than I do.

Mr. HAMILTON. Has the gentleman yet introduced this bill?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. No.

Mr. JAMES. I would like to say to the gentleman that, so far as I am concerned, I think this question of an income tax upon the great fortunes of the rich has been put off thirteen years too long as it is now.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. That is all I care to say at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and also the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], said, in opening their speeches, that this was not the time for an academic discussion of the tariff bill, but before I discuss the bill itself I want to ask the House to pardon me for making a few academic remarks on the subject, because my situation is somewhat different from that of other Members of this House. I represent a great manufacturing district. When I was first elected to Congress from that district, I was nominated by the Democrats of my district on a platform declaring in favor of a tariff for revenue.

I have maintained that position ever since, but I often find myself in the anomalous attitude of having some of my constituents who are protectionists declare that I am a free trader, and often find that when I am in Washington some of my colleagues, because I come here from a manufacturing district, assert that I am a protectionist. I therefore want to make a statement before I come to the discussion of the Payne bill as to what my position is.

The consideration of the questions involved in the bill now pending before the House brings before us all the lights and shadows of varying intensity involved in the taxation of imported commodities, from the position of the extreme prohibitive protectionist to that of the free trader. In my judgment, with a deficit in the Treasury estimated all the way from \$100,000,000 to \$150,000,000, the most important question for us to consider at this time is the raising of sufficient revenue to support the Government. I believe that a large majority of the people of

the United States favor a system of taxation by duties levied on imports of foreign merchandise and that the country desires Congress to continue this mode of raising revenue.

The urgent necessity for a revision of the present tariff laws of the country is apparent to all; in the first place, the present revenues are not sufficient to support the Government; in the next place, the development of improved business methods and advances in the processes of manufacture, due to improved machinery, have made the taxes levied under the Dingley bill out of adjustment with the present needs of the business interests of the country, in many instances prohibitive to such an extent that they not only do not produce revenue, but are a direct injury to the great productive interests of the Nation.

In the preparation of a bill, the differences that exist between the two great parties are not the issue of protection against free trade, but the true issue is that one desires to write a protective tariff that leans toward prohibition of imports and the other a revenue tariff that favors fair competition. Although we occasionally find a free trader within the ranks of the Democratic party, the great rank and file of the party do not favor the doctrine of free trade. There has never been a platform of a national convention since the organization of the Democratic party that has advocated free-trade theories; they have always maintained the true position of the party was in favor of a tariff for revenue. There never has been a tariff bill enacted into law by the Democratic party that has not favored the doctrine of a tariff for revenue as opposed to a tariff levied along free-trade lines, such as the revenue laws of Great Britain.

The most distinctive Democratic tariff bill that was ever written on the statute books of this country was the Walker tariff of 1846, and, although the duties levied under this tariff did not exceed 30 per cent ad valorem, they were levied on competitive articles, such as wool, cotton, iron, and steel; sugar and coffee, noncompetitive articles, were placed on the free list, which clearly demonstrates that the Democratic party in preparing its tariff bills has favored a duty levied for revenue, and also stood for the incidental protection that might arise from the levying of such a duty.

The true distinction between the two great parties of this country, to my mind, is the difference between a prohibitive tariff bill and a competitive tariff bill; the Republican party favors a tariff that will raise some revenue to support the Government, but at the same time will prohibit the importation of as much foreign merchandise from coming into the country as is possible and raise revenue at all, for although the Republican party has repeatedly declared that they favor a tariff to protect the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, they have placed their duties so greatly in excess of this amount, and in so many cases at prohibitive rates, that we are compelled to reach a conclusion that their tariff bills are written to prohibit and not for the purpose of equalizing the difference of the cost of production; in fact, they are protecting the manufacturer in his profits, as declared in the last Republican platform. The Democratic party has always declared for a tariff for revenue.

It is true that any tariff taxes that are levied which allow some imports to enter the country would in one sense be a tariff for revenue, but I take it that the clear meaning of the declaration of the party in favor of a tariff for revenue means a competitive tariff—that is, a tariff that allows sufficient imports of every product made in the United States to be imported from abroad to bring about fair and honest competition, thereby producing revenue and at the same time preventing the home producer from hiding behind a tariff wall that will enable him to establish monopolies and unduly increase the burdens of taxation resting upon the American people without their receiving any benefit in return, either in the shape of revenue for the Government or in the development of the great industrial interests of the country; for it is an axiom that can not be disputed that the moment any industry is enabled to create a monopoly, its development along lines of best endeavor at once ceases.

If there was a more general understanding that the tariff is a tax in which private interests share the proceeds with the Government, there would be a more rigorous questioning of the various duties imposed by Congress than has yet been manifest.

Professor Taussig, in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee at the recent hearings, stated:

Protection is granted for the purpose of enabling new industries to establish themselves and to offset the difference in cost at home and abroad. If an infant industry can not be strong and lusty in a reasonable time, it shows it is developed by artificial means and is not justified, and the props should be taken away. Statistics conclusively show that most of our industries are now able to stand alone.

Again he stated:

Our natural advantages, improved machinery, efficiency of American labor, and ocean freight rates in many instances overcome the difference in cost of labor at home and abroad.

The facts developed before the Ways and Means Committee on the pending bill demonstrate beyond a doubt that if the definition as defined by Professor Taussig of a tariff for protection is the truth, that there are very few, if any, American industries that are left within its terms or entitled to its support. On the other hand, the testimony is conclusive that the present rates of duty are far in excess of the difference in the cost of production; and when the tariff duties exceed the difference of the cost of production at home and abroad they are of necessity levied for the sole purpose of protecting the manufacturer's profits, which, to my mind, can not be justified under any circumstances, for when the manufacturer has a fair field on equal terms he should be required to rely on his own resources, energy, and business judgment to successfully meet his competitor and drive him from the field. Whenever you agree to the doctrine that he is entitled to a protective wall to prevent competition, you have laid the foundation stone to create monopoly and to unduly and unjustly lay burdens upon the consuming masses of the people.

Prior to the war of 1812 the duties levied under the tariff acts, although they incidentally afforded some protection, were clearly levied solely for the purpose of obtaining revenue; but during the war of 1812 the embargo acts and other restrictions that necessarily arose from the war developed certain lines of manufacture to an extent that they were controlling the American market at prices above those justified by normal conditions.

To maintain this stilted condition, they called on Congress to enact a tariff that would protect them against foreign competition, and the tariff of 1816, carrying an average rate of 20 per cent ad valorem, was an outgrowth of this sentiment. From that day to this the great industries of this country have been fostered and protected by tariff laws, in many instances prohibitive laws, in order that they might grow strong and self-sustaining. As the infant industry grew, in most instances the tariff rates increased instead of diminishing, until we have reached a condition where the duties are so high they no longer produce a fair amount of revenue, and in a great many instances by the continual increase of the duty. In other cases it has been brought about by allowing the old duties to remain when the progress and development of the American industry had placed it in a position where it was enabled to compete on equal terms with its foreign rival.

In a speech delivered in the House of Representatives on the 4th of March last, Mr. TAWNEY, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, stated that there would be a deficit in the Treasury at the end of this fiscal year amounting to \$150,000,000. I do not think he has made an overestimate. It is absolutely necessary to meet this deficit or we will bring disaster to the Government and the business interests of the country.

There are but three ways in which the deficit can be avoided. First, by reducing expenditures; this seems to be impossible under a Republican administration. Second, by levying taxes additional to those now imposed on the people, in order that the present tariff duties assessed in the interests of the manufacturer may not be disturbed. Third, by reducing the present prohibitive duties of the Dingley bill to a competitive basis, where they will produce sufficient revenue to meet the demands of the Treasury. The protective sentiment in this country has been fostered and cherished for so many years by the Republican party that many great manufacturing interests look upon it as a vested right and seem to believe that, regardless of whether the Government has sufficient revenue to maintain it or not, they are entitled to the absolute and entire control of the American market without competition from abroad. This clearly is not a healthy condition of affairs. Where any great corporation in the United States controls 50 per cent or more of the production of a particular commodity the people are in arms at once and declare it to be a trust; that legislation is needed to control it; that it is not entitled to control 50 per cent of the supply of any great commodity that the people need. And yet, when the great industries in any particular branch of productive development control 99 per cent of the American market against foreign competition, and in many instances make special agreements among themselves to maintain prices, the contention is made that such a tariff is not monopolistic in its tendency, and that such industries are entitled to the absolute and undivided control of the American market for the sale of their product, regardless of the condition of the Treasury and regardless of the right of the consumer to have a reasonable competition to regulate prices.

The Census Bureau prepared a pamphlet entitled "Imports, exports, and domestic manufactures," arranged according to the paragraphs of the tariff law of 1907 for the use of the Ways

and Means Committee at its recent hearings. From the facts contained in this pamphlet, I ascertained that the total imports from foreign countries under the so-called "Dingley bill" for the year 1905 amounted to \$547,391,557; that the total production of articles protected under the terms of this act in the United States for the year 1905 amounted to \$13,543,180,743, and the total consumption of commodities by the American people enumerated in the Dingley Act in the year 1905 amounted to \$14,081,572,300, from which it is estimated that the total imports as compared to the total consumption of these products amounted to only 3½ per cent of the American consumption. Of course, in the estimating of these amounts by the Census Bureau there has been some duplications, as there are some duplications in estimating the imports, but the figures are official and are a fair indication of how prohibitive the Dingley rates have become. Schedule A of the tariff bill covers chemicals, oils, and paints; the imports under this schedule amounted to \$31,000,000 and the gross consumption of articles named in this section amounted to \$604,000,000, making the percentage of imports to gross consumption only 5½ per cent. In the same way, estimating each schedule of the tariff bill from the same report, I find in Schedule B, earthenware, and glassware, the imports were 5½ per cent; Schedule C, metals and the manufactures of, were 1½ per cent; Schedule D, wood and the manufactures of, were 1½ per cent; Schedule E, sugar, molasses and the manufactures of, were 18½ per cent; Schedule F, tobacco and the manufactures of, were 6½ per cent; Schedule H, spirits, wines, and other beverages, were 3½ per cent; Schedule J, flax, hemp, and jute and the manufactures of, were 28½ per cent; Schedule K, wool and the manufactures of, were 6½ per cent; Schedule L, silk and silk goods, were 25½ per cent; Schedule M, pulp, paper, and books, were 2½ per cent; Schedule N, sundries, were 5½ per cent; and articles manufactured in whole or in part not specifically provided for in the enumerated schedules but imported, the percentage of imports to gross consumption amounted to a little over two-thirds of 1 per cent.

The comparison of the imports with the amount of the American consumption show that the reason the Dingley bill does not raise sufficient revenue to support the Government is because of the prohibitive rates that are in that bill. In order to avoid question of duplications as far as possible and at the same time ascertain the prohibitive tendency of the present tariff laws, I have selected the following figures from the special reports of the census on manufactures, comparing the same articles in each case: Showed an importation in the year 1860 of \$33,000,000, as compared to the domestic production of \$115,000,000, or a percentage of foreign importation of 28 per cent. That was immediately before the civil war, and a Democratic tariff law was on the statute books. In 1880 the imports amounted to \$31,000,000, the domestic production to \$192,000,000, and the percentage of foreign imports to 16½ per cent; in 1890 the percentage of imports was 11½ per cent, and in 1900 10 per cent. In 1905 the imports amounted to \$42,000,000 and the domestic production to \$400,000,000; the percentage of importation was 9½ per cent, showing that ever since the Republican party has entered on its policy of protection that there has been a continued raising of the rates and a continual cutting down of importations as compared to the amount of the American consumption and a proportionate falling of the revenue, due to the prohibitive rates placed in its revenue laws.

In 1860 the importation of woolen manufactures, exclusive of duplications, amounted to 58 per cent; in 1890 to 20½ per cent, and in 1905 it had fallen to the small figure of 4½ per cent. During the hearings several gentlemen appeared before us who testified that they had been engaged in the manufacture of woolen goods for thirty or forty years. I asked these witnesses if they could recall the time when they first engaged in the manufacture of woolen goods, and they said they could. I asked them if the industry prospered at that time, and they said it did; and I asked if it was seemingly as prosperous then as now, and they said it was; and yet at that time there was all the way from 20 to 30 per cent of importations, and now, under the Dingley bill, it has been reduced to 4½ per cent.

If the woolen manufacturing business could prosper when 20 per cent of importations were coming into this country, and they testified that it did, why can not they prosper to-day with a fairly competitive tariff instead of a practically prohibitive one? It is a self-evident fact that we can not raise sufficient revenue to support the Government if we continue to apply the prohibitive duties we have had in the Dingley bill that are continued in the Payne bill, with one single exception, and that is on tops. The Government is in need of revenue, and the woolen manufacturers and their representatives here are not willing to con-

tribute their fair portion of this taxation to the Treasury that they exact from the people by a prohibitive tariff that enables them to increase their profits and avoid competition.

In 1860 the importation of woolen manufactures, exclusive of duplication, amounted to 58 per cent; in 1890 to 20½ per cent, and in 1905 to 4½ per cent.

In 1860 the importation of silk manufactures amounted to 500 per cent, and in 1880 to 78 per cent, and in 1905 to 19½ per cent. The importation of leather for the last three censuses varies from 3½ per cent to 2½ per cent in 1905; from 1870 to 1905 the importation of lumber, excluding duplications, varied from 4½ to 2½ per cent, showing that lumber and leather goods have been protected by prohibitive tariff rates for many years past. In 1880 the percentage of importations of glass amounted to 24 per cent, in 1890 to 18 per cent, and in 1905 to 7½ per cent. These figures clearly demonstrate the fact that the Dingley bill is not a protective bill or a revenue bill, but in most of its leading features is a prohibitive bill.

In order to cure the evils of a prohibitive tariff, there is only one way in which it can be accomplished, and that is by reducing the rates of particular commodities to a point where a reasonable amount of importations is allowed and where fair competition is encouraged.

With 90 per cent of the American market assured to the American producer, most assuredly there is no danger of the industry in which he is engaged languishing or being driven out of business by the competitor. On the other hand, an importation of 10 per cent from foreign countries of all the products of American consumption covered by the Dingley tariff schedules would produce all the revenue that the needs of the country require and at the same time prevent the great corporations of America from forming combinations behind prohibitive tariff walls that produce monopolies.

The criticism that I make as to the bill presented by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee is that it does not accomplish this result, that it does not reduce the rates to a revenue and fairly competitive basis, which I hope to be able to point out later on in my argument by comparison of the rates on particular articles enumerated in the new bill.

The principal argument that has been made for the protected interests in favor of prohibitive duties is that it protects American labor; but the facts show very clearly that there is hardly an industry protected by the Dingley tariff law where the amount of protection afforded has not been far in excess of the difference between the labor cost at home and abroad.

In the first place, by reason of improved machinery, organization, better methods of conducting business, the efficiency of American labor is far in excess of that of most foreign labor, and, as a rule, the unit of production costs less in this country than it does abroad. Of course, when you balance the competition, it is not the daily wage that determines the ability to compete, but the amount of wages that enter into each unit of production.

I find in the report of the secretary of internal affairs of the State of Pennsylvania a very interesting and accurate tabulation of statistics of manufactures. It is Official Document No. 9, page 69. This document shows that the combined production of the steel works and rolling mills for the year 1907 for the State of Pennsylvania amounted to 12,953,000 gross tons, at a total valuation of \$504,167,000.

The average yearly earnings of persons employed in the steel works and rolling mills are shown to be \$663.80 per year in the mills of Pennsylvania. The two great foreign competitors of this country in iron and steel production are England and Germany. It is conceded by all that the wages of Germany are lower than those of England. The report of Mr. Charles M. Pepper, special agent of the Department of Commerce and Labor, shows that the annual wages of the iron and steel workers in Germany are little more than half of the American wage scale. The Pennsylvania report which I have just referred to shows that the average value of the production of each employee in the mills of Pennsylvania amounts to \$3,661. In other words, the average wage in the iron and steel mills in Pennsylvania is \$663 as compared with an earning capacity of each employee of \$3,661, making the labor cost only 18 per cent of the value of the product of the employee; and the German wage scale being only one-half of the American, 9 per cent of the cost of production would cover the entire difference in the wage scale.

The statistical abstract shows that the total importations of iron and steel produced for the year 1905 amounted to \$35,640,000 and the revenue collected amounted to \$8,159,000, showing an average ad valorem rate on iron and steel products coming into this country of 22 per cent. As a matter of fact, the taxes levied on most iron and steel products are in excess of

this rate, as the importations of ore and pig iron reduce the average of the articles imported at higher rates of duty. But accepting 22 per cent as the average rate, and one-half of 18 per cent as the difference in the labor cost at home and abroad, it shows that the American manufacturer is afforded a protection under the duties levied in the Dingley law of 13 per cent above the difference in the cost of the labor of production, the home producer also having ocean freight rates in his favor.

The same report, referred to above, shows that the average yearly earnings of men employed in the tin-plate industry in Pennsylvania amounted to \$722, and the average value of the production for each employee amounted to \$2,127, making the labor cost 23 per cent of the value of the product. The duty on tin plate in the Dingley bill is 1½ cents per pound, equal to an average ad valorem rate of from 42 per cent to 54 per cent. If the labor cost abroad is one-half of the labor cost in America, it gives to the American producer from 30 per cent to 40 per cent protection over and above the labor cost.

The same report shows that the average value produced by each employee in the manufacture of cotton and woolen yarns in Pennsylvania is \$2,825, and the average yearly earnings of each employee are \$363. This report shows that the textile industries of Philadelphia pay their employees on an average \$429 a year, and that these employees produce an average value of product amounting to \$2,094.

The same report shows that the average value produced by each employee in cotton, woolen, waste, and shoddy manufactures amounts to \$5,846, and the average yearly wage in these industries was about \$449; that the woolen and worsted goods produced by each employee amounts to \$2,445, and the average yearly earnings amount to \$454.

When it is borne in mind that the average ad valorem rate of duty on the importations of worsted goods runs all the way from 50 per cent to 140 per cent, and the percentage of labor cost is only 18 per cent of the value of the product produced by each man, and the English workman receives at least one-half the American wage scale, making a difference in the labor cost in any case not to exceed 9 or 10 per cent of the value of the American product, it shows what an enormous protection is given to the industry above the difference in the labor cost at home and abroad.

There is no question that a tariff bill can be written based fairly on the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, making due allowance for the difference in freight rates, that will be on a fair, reasonable, competitive basis, and that will afford ample revenue to supply all the needs of the Government.

The American people will not be satisfied with any other solution of the tariff question. They realize that the great industries of this country are no longer infant industries in swaddling clothes. They have become giants in power and development; that in most of the industries they are paying the cost of transportation across the seas and competing on equal terms with their foreign rivals in the markets of the Orient, in South America, and in many cases actually in the European markets.

This being the case, there is no reason that can be given to sustain a protective tariff, especially when it is written along prohibitive lines. The real justification for a tariff can be only for the purpose of raising revenue to support the Government, and adjust it on a basis that will fairly represent the difference in cost abroad and at home, if such exists, and if not, at such rates as will not prohibit the importation and be competitive.

When this is done the tariff will cease to be a political issue, and it will be adjusted along business lines and improve business conditions. But as long as it is maintained to protect monopoly and to pay political debts it will continue to be a sore in the life of the Nation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us consider the bill before the House. I want to call the attention of the committee to those paragraphs that provide for free raw material. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee announced in his opening statement that he was a believer in the doctrine of free raw material. Being a protectionist, I believe he can justify his position in favor of free raw material. As far back as three-quarters of a century ago Henry Clay announced that one of the ways in which you could protect the industries of the country was to give them free raw materials. Manifestly so. Protection looks to giving some one something, and it is of no importance to the manufacturer at which end of the line you give him the protection, whether you raise the tariff taxes so high as to prevent competition from abroad and enable him to control the entire market at his own prices or whether, on the other hand, you exempt him from the taxation that is being paid by other people and give into the coffers of his treasury a free gift that other people are obliged to pay for.

I do not see anything inconsistent in the position of the gentlemen who advocate a protective tariff for the benefit of the industries of this country and at the same time advocate giving them free raw material in order that they may make a profit out of it.

But I do say that if the theory of the Democratic party is a correct one, that we are only entitled to levy taxes for the purpose of raising revenue, then we should distribute taxation as broadly as possible, so that its burdens may be borne equitably and evenly by all. That being the case, I do not see how a Democrat can justify himself in the position that what the manufacturer buys should be free and what the people use should be taxed. When he comes to that proposition he admits that he is giving the manufacturer an exemption from taxation for the purpose of making that business prosperous and refuses to levy tariff taxes for the same purpose. Is not the doctrine of free raw material exactly the same position the Republican protectionist takes when he proposes a high protective tariff to make business prosperous? But, although the gentleman from New York may be consistent in his theory in believing in free raw material as a Republican doctrine, I do not believe he has been consistent in his theory in applying his principles to the bill that is presented to the House.

The bill has placed a number of articles that are called "raw material" on the free list. I cannot stop now to enumerate them all, but there are three or four marked instances of this kind. He justifies the putting of ore on the free list, and he says in doing so that it is perfectly fair, because the Spanish ores are only 40 per cent and the Cuban only 50 per cent of metallic iron, and that the ores in New York run 60 per cent, and, therefore, to admit these ores free will only balance the difference.

Now, Mr. Chairman, they may have 60 per cent ore in New York. I will not deny the proposition, because I am not informed. I have heard, however, a great deal of talk in this country about 60 per cent ore, and I have found very little of it. In the opening of a new mine at the top of a vein, where the effect of the atmosphere and water has taken out the impurities, we often find a high grade of ore, but when you get down into the bowels of the earth, where the real mining begins, it is very seldom that you find an ore which runs on an average about 50 per cent of metallic iron. The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of Mr. Schwab, of the Bethlehem Iron Works, and Judge Gary, of the United States Steel Corporation, was to the effect that the average run of the great Mesaba Range ore was only 49 per cent. So that I do not think that the explanation as given by the chairman of the committee as to why he placed ore on the free list is a sufficient reason. As a matter of fact, I think I can give a better reason from the gentleman's position. What ores they have left in New York State are hard ores, and they need a soft ore to mix with that hard ore so that it can be properly smelted. They import ores for that reason. They imported ores from Spain and from Cuba, and it looks to me very much as if the gentleman from New York had placed ore on the free list because the ironmasters of New York did not want to pay a revenue duty on the ore they were using in their own furnaces. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In 1894 we had not made the recent treaty with Cuba, and the larger percentage of foreign ores was coming from Spain instead of Cuba. In 1907 the treaty with Cuba had gone into effect, giving Cuba the benefit of the 20 per cent reduction, and the importations shifted largely from Spain to Cuba. So I have the figures for both years to show what amount of ore was imported. In the year 1904 we imported \$2,334,789 worth of ore from Spain and Europe, and \$346,439 worth of ore from Cuba, making a total of \$2,681,228 of iron ore imported, paying into the Treasury \$466,307. In 1907 we imported into this country \$1,212,607 worth from Europe and from Cuba \$2,137,784, making a total of \$3,250,391 of iron ore that paid a duty of \$391,544, showing that the imports of ore on an average have paid into the Treasury of the United States something in excess of \$400,000 a year.

The Republican party says that it is in favor of protection in order to protect the American laborer against the cheap labor of Europe and other foreign countries. Now, mark that, when you consider the proposition the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has laid before this House on the question of free ore. When you come to the consideration of the raw product like ore, it is largely one man's muscle against another man's muscle.

As you rise in the higher grades of manufacturing, improved machinery and American methods eliminate the difference in labor costs, and in many instances you find, although the labor cost per day in Europe is less than in this country, that when you come to the unit of production in articles of higher manufacture the American laborer produces as much and more than

the foreign laborer for the amount of wages paid. But that is essentially not so when you come down to raw material, where it is merely muscle against muscle; and that is true in raw materials like iron ore. The men who are working in the mines in Michigan and Minnesota, in the great Mesaba Range, are shipping their ore to the eastward and coming in competition along the Atlantic seaboard with foreign ore.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. If the statement the gentleman has just made is correct, that in the raw material it is a contest between muscle and muscle, while the unit of value in the more finished and higher products may show that there is more value per laborer in America as to the cost, does not that then lead to the conclusion that the raw material is more deserving of protection than the finished product, if the laborer is the man you are trying to help?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think so, from the standpoint of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. HARDY. That is from the standpoint of the man who says he wants to protect the American laborer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. From the standpoint of the protectionist that should be true. I believe in a revenue tariff on articles imported. I am merely placing this proposition before the House from the standpoint of the gentleman from New York, who stands as a protectionist and says he favors the protection of American labor. The gentleman from New York says the difference in cost is eliminated. I am surprised at that statement, because the Department of Commerce and Labor filed with the Committee on Ways and Means an official report showing the difference in the cost of material used in the iron and steel works of this country. That report is now on file in the rooms of the committee, although I do not believe it has been published. I want to show you from an actual statement of fact how much it costs to lay Mesaba ore—American ore—at seaboard and how much it costs to lay foreign ore there.

The agents of the Government, under the Bureau of Corporations, inspected the books of the various steel plants of this country. They have filed their reports, and, among others, it shows the cost sheet that is taken from the books of the Maryland Steel Company, located down here at Sparrows Point, Md., for 1906.

Now, these figures were made up by the manufacturer as the actual cost shown on his books, afterwards taken by a Government expert and turned in to the Committee on Ways and Means. There were no patched-up figures, no preparation in advance, but they went back to the company's books and got those figures. Now, what does it show? It shows that the Maryland Steel Company used in 1906, 63,772 tons of Mesaba ore that cost them at their furnaces \$4.86 per ton. It shows they used of foreign ore, which was Spanish ore, 152,088 tons that cost them \$3.97 per ton. Now, mark you, here is a report showing that the Spanish ore, after paying 40 per cent duty, went into the furnaces of the Maryland Steel Company at 89 cents per ton less than the American ore. It shows that they used 447,274 tons of Cuban iron ore, at a cost of \$4.47 per ton, or 39 cents less than they had to pay for Mesaba ore. Now, I take it that that is a fair statement of the cost of ore to the furnaces along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. SIMS. May I interrupt the gentleman from Alabama right there?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Is there such a difference in the metallic contents of the ore as to make up that difference?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, there is this difference in the metallic contents, as testified to by Judge Gary and Mr. Schwab: The Mesaba ores run 49 per cent, the Spanish ores run about 40 per cent, and Cuban ores about 50 per cent, so, although there is a little difference as to the Spanish ores, which were 89 cents per ton cheaper, the Cuban ore has 1 per cent more metallic contents than the American ore.

Mr. SIMS. And comes in cheaper.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And comes in cheaper.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. How much cheaper?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Thirty-nine cents cheaper, after paying the duty. Now, the gentleman from New York desires to give to these manufacturers located in New York and along the Atlantic seaboard 40 cents a ton that can not possibly affect the American price of the American finished products. But a small per cent of American pig iron is made by the furnaces located along the Atlantic seaboard. The great productive centers for steel and iron manufacture of this country are Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Birmingham. None of them uses foreign ores. They all use American ores and they fix the price of iron and steel.

The price is fixed by what pig iron or the finished rail is quoted at in Pittsburg, Birmingham, or Chicago, and these furnaces along the seaboard merely adapt their price to the price fixed by the great centers, and therefore will not reduce their price one cent by reason of this gift of free ore, and the result is that the gentleman from New York, who says that he favors the protection of American labor, is about to take off 40 cents a ton on raw ore when the foreign ore comes in cheaper now than they can buy the American ore, for the single purpose of making a gift of \$400,000 a year out of the Federal Treasury to certain special interests that are close to and many of them located along the Atlantic seaboard. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, that is not all. Some of these eastern manufacturers also want cheap pig iron. One of the principal witnesses who came before the Committee on Ways and Means was a gentleman from New York who was very anxious to obtain all of his raw material without paying any taxes to the Government.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. HOBSON. Before the gentleman leaves the question of the cost of ore at the furnaces I wish to ask him, as he quoted \$4.86 as the cost, as determined by the Government, to be the cost—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not say it was determined by the Government. I said it was taken by government agents from the books of the Maryland Steel Company as showing what they actually paid.

Mr. HOBSON. That being the amount paid, and that ore had to be transported much farther than the ore used at Pittsburg and on the near-lake points, I wish to ask the gentleman how does he reconcile that statement with the statement of Mr. Gary that the average cost of their ore at the furnaces is \$8.62?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, the gentleman from Alabama is mistaken as to Judge Gary's statement. Judge Gary did not state that the average cost of a ton of ore was \$8.62. His statement was in reference to the amount of ore that went into a ton of pig iron, which is a very different proposition.

Mr. HOBSON. I misunderstood the gentleman. The figure he quoted, then, refers to a ton of iron, for which one and eighty-three one-hundredths tons of ore are necessary.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; which is an entirely different proposition.

Now, on this question of free raw materials. As I say, it looks to me very much like this bill had been written for the benefit of the people who live in New England and New York. Wherever we find a reduction made, we find it going home in that direction, but where we find a finished product made in New England or New York, like wool, cotton goods, or gloves, we do not find any reduction made at all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman at all, nor to break in any way the force of his legitimate conclusion, but in connection with the cost of ore, I wish to call attention to the fact that the estimated cost per ton of ore, \$4.86, includes certain profits and certain allowances that are not permissible. These will doubtless come out when the gentleman takes up the question of the cost of pig iron and of steel. I hope to take them up in some detail when I get time of my own.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, there is another item in the bill in which they have given these eastern furnaces and manufacturers free raw material, and that is on scrap iron. Scrap is old pans, broken rails, old stoves, anything that is picked up and brought to the furnace and used to melt down to make pig metal. Under the laws that have heretofore been passed by Congress, scrap, which can be used sometimes in place of pig iron, has always borne the same rate of duty as pig iron. But under this bill scrap is placed at 50 cents a ton and pig iron at \$2.50 a ton, and it is not going to reduce the cost of the finished product to the ultimate consumer any more than the gift of free ore is going to reduce the cost to the ultimate consumer.

In 1907 we collected at the custom-house \$86,000 on scrap at \$4 a ton. Should the same amount of scrap come into the United States under the duty of 50 cents a ton it will only amount to \$10,000, a gift of some \$70,000 out of the Federal Treasury to these manufacturers.

The same thing is true of coal. This bill practically puts coal on the free list. It is true that it does not do so directly, but it says that when Canada allows American coal to go in the Canadian market free we will let Canadian coal come into this market free. What does that mean? It means that New England wants free coal as well as free scrap and free

ore, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] proposes to make them a present of \$695,000 a year in free coal.

Then, there is another place where they have adopted his position on free raw material, and that is with hides. I want to tell you about hides. When we were in the Ways and Means Committee, having hearings on this bill, a very large number of gentlemen in the shoe and leather business came before the committee and advocated free hides. And when they first came, fearing that they could not get free hides without they had free shoes, one of them was asked as to whether, if the committee gave him free hides, he was willing to give the American people free shoes, and he said he was. That statement met with applause around that whole circle of manufacturers. He said if he was given free hides, so that he could manufacture his product without paying a duty on hides, that the only thing that would bound the American industry in boots and shoes would be the high dome of heaven. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman from Alabama refer to the evidence of Mr. Jones?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I am not sure whether it was Mr. Jones who made that statement or another witness who made it, but he was one of the witnesses when Mr. Jones was there.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Made the statement that if everything connected with the shoe business was free, then he could stand free boots and shoes? But I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that every man who made that statement was the maker of fine shoes, worth from \$4 to \$5 a pair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I remember Mr. Jones's testimony very distinctly. He came before the committee and was willing to give up all protection to get free hides. Then he went back and talked with a few other manufacturers and a few weeks afterwards he came back again to the committee and took it all back.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain to me, if he can, this peculiar desire on the part of gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber to keep up the price of the poor man's shoes, the plain shoes, and their indifference to the prices of the rich man's shoes? It seems to be presumed that they can not protect the value of the rich man's shoes any longer, but they seem specially anxious to keep up the price of the brogan and shoes that sell under \$4 or \$5 per pair.

Mr. WEISSE. If the gentleman will allow me to, I will take the canvass that was made of the eastern shoemakers by the Shoe and Leather Reporter of 1906. They asked if they were willing to give up the duty on hides and on shoes if hides were admitted free. In reply to that canvass, according to the Reporter, they agreed to remove the whole duty by 140 out of 231 shoe manufacturers.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I do not wish to take up the gentleman's time too much, but I stated on the floor of this House at that time, three years ago, that, in my opinion, 65 per cent of the shoemakers in my district could stand free boots and shoes, but the other 35 per cent would be driven to the wall. As the gentleman from Wisconsin knows full well, ever since the United Shoes Company have gone out and put their shoes in Missouri, Finland, and Switzerland on the same day that they do at Haverhill, the situation is entirely changed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I am not advocating free shoes, nor am I an advocate of free hides. As I stated before, I believe in a revenue tax; I believe that all of these manufactures should pay a revenue tax to support the Government, on the raw material as well as the finished product. What I am criticising is the position of the majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee in their efforts to give free hides to the manufacturer and at the same time leave them with a practically prohibitive duty on boots, shoes, and leather.

There is practically no competition from abroad on boots and shoes, and the American manufacturer fixes his own prices to the consumer. There is no necessity to give free hides to the American shoe man in order that he may build up his business in the markets of the world, because, under the rebate clause in the Dingley bill he was entitled to a drawback of 99 per cent on all the duties paid on hides when he shipped his manufactured goods out of the country; but the shoe men say the law enabled the man who was not conscientious about his statements to receive the drawback, but did not let an honest man get it back. But the Payne bill does away with all difficulties in tracing the raw material into the finished product. If the manufacturer brings hides into this country he can take his

receipt, and if he ships an equal amount of manufactured leather, whether it be the same leather or not, out of the country within three years he can go to the Treasury Department and demand back the amount of the duty he paid on the hides less 1 per cent. So that as to his foreign trade there is absolutely no reason in the world why he should have free hides, and as to his domestic trade he has no competition from abroad.

He will fix the prices to-morrow as he fixes them to-day, and the American consumer will not receive his shoes one nickel cheaper than he does to-day; and yet this bill proposes to give the amount of duty collected on hides, which in the year 1907 amounted to \$3,115,390, to the boot and shoe manufacturers of this country as a donation.

Now, what does the bill do? It takes ore, and coal, and scrap, and hides from the dutiable list and puts them on the free list. In these articles that it has put on the free list it does not give to the consumer any reduction in the burden of taxation, but absolutely gives to the manufacturers of the United States \$4,287,414 out of the Federal Treasury and has to put a tax on tea and coffee on the poor people of this country to make up that difference. [Loud applause.]

Now then there is another point.

Mr. LOVERING. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman mean to say that this \$4,000,000 goes entirely to the manufacturers? Does it not go to the workmen, the operatives?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all, in my judgment. I know no reason why it should.

Mr. LOVERING. Does the gentleman mean that is that much superadded to the profits of the manufacturer?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it will be.

Mr. LOVERING. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not see any reason why it should not. I think time has demonstrated absolutely that the laborer of this country gets his pay because it is fixed by his organization; and it is a question between him and the manufacturer absolutely as to how much pay he is going to get; and if we make this gift of free raw material, not one cent of it will go into the laborer's pocket.

Mr. LOVERING. Now, one word more, if I may be permitted. Last year, as I understand, we exported between \$12,000,000 and \$13,000,000 worth of shoes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. LOVERING. Was there no labor involved in that? If we had not exported those shoes, would not the laborers of this country have been deprived of just that amount of labor?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; but let me say to the gentleman, as I have just said, that on the boots and shoes you export, where you buy foreign hides you get a rebate back into your own pockets of 99 per cent, and therefore you do not pay any duty into the Federal Treasury on the export business. The same thing is true as to other raw materials imported, manufactured here, and afterwards exported.

Mr. LOVERING. It is paid once into the United States Treasury. It is paid once back and the incident is closed. That is the end of it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You do not want it paid back more than once on the same hides?

Mr. LOVERING. That is sufficient.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If you import the hide and send it out as a shoe, you pay the duty on the hide and get it back when you send it out in the shoe, and that is all you ought to get back.

Mr. LOVERING. That is all we claim.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Therefore on the export business this does not cut any figure at all.

Mr. LOVERING. It cuts this figure, that that \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000 worth of shoes exported last year furnished labor to a certain number of people in the United States which would not otherwise have been afforded.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman understands that I am not raising any question against the rebate that is paid back on the foreign shipments of foreign hides, but what I am objecting to is giving back to these people the duty they paid on hides or ought to pay on hides for the domestic business. They get it back in any event when they engage in foreign trade.

Mr. LOVERING. Precisely the same as though the hides were brought in and the shoes manufactured in bond and again exported.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Does the gentleman believe that the amount of this duty that is proposed to be taken off from hides will ever find its way into the pay envelope of the employees engaged in manufacturing boots and shoes?

Mr. LOVERING. The rebate or drawback would not be operative with free hides. The gentleman understands that.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I understand that.

Mr. LOVERING. It is only under the Dingley bill, where a duty of 15 per cent was placed on those hides, and that duty was again repaid when the manufactured product was exported, that it has been of any effective value to the people of this country.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. If the duty was taken off from hides, or an additional duty was put on the manufactured product, thereby raising the price, does the gentleman believe that in either one of those instances the difference would find its way, without the action of the unions or organizations of labor, into the pay envelopes of the employees?

Mr. LOVERING. Without the least doubt in the world.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Then the gentleman's experience has been different from mine.

Mr. LOVERING. I have been a manufacturer all my days.

Mr. STANLEY. It strikes me that the gentleman's premises, so ably laid down, justify a conclusion much stronger than he has drawn. The system of rebating, as it now exists, would encourage the exportation of shoes by offering this bonus in the way of the repayment of the duty.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly.

Mr. STANLEY. If that duty on hides is taken off entirely, without a corresponding reduction of the duty on shoes, it strikes me that there will be less encouragement to exportation. The manufacturer can make fewer shoes for export, his smaller sales being compensated by larger profits.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not sure that I go as far as the gentleman does in his conclusion in that matter; but at any rate, as far as the foreign trade is concerned, whether the duties are kept on hides or not, it does not affect that so far as the American consumer is concerned. He is not going to get his shoes for one cent less, but the Treasury of the United States is going to lose over \$3,000,000 a year when it needs it by the removal of the duty on hides.

Mr. PARSONS. Is the gentleman opposed to free raw materials?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Most emphatically. I do not believe in free raw materials any more than I believe in the doctrine of protection. I believe in a tariff levied for revenue, at a fair competitive basis, and spread over the commodities that are imported into the country.

Mr. PARSONS. One more question. Referring to the wool schedule, does the gentleman criticize the duty on raw wool from which we derive a revenue of \$17,000,000?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would not put raw wool on the free list, but to carry out the idea of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, they ought to put it on the free list to be consistent. Why should they put hides and iron ore on the free list, and say they believe in free raw materials and not put wool on the free list?

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman does not answer my question. I asked whether he is opposed to the present duty on raw wool.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will come to wool after a while. I am not in favor of free wool; I am in favor of a tariff for revenue on everything.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I would like to ask if it has not become perfectly manifest since this discussion began that these manufacturers in the East are demanding free raw material because they believe in excessive protection and realize that it is an additional protection to their interest?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman's conclusion is absolutely correct.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. There are shoe manufacturers in my district who claim that if they get free hides they will be able to reduce the price of boots and shoes to the ultimate consumer—that is, they claim there is competition in the shoe business throughout the country, and that if they can have free raw material they can reduce the price of boots and shoes in the market.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that free hides, in my judgment, although it has been asserted otherwise by some, free hides will not make more than a cent difference in a shoe, and that cent will never get down to the consumer, and the \$3,000,000 on hides will go into the treasury of the boot and shoe manufacturers who import hides. I know that they contend that it will go to the people, but I deny the contention.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. They can make a reasonable profit and reduce the price of shoes to the people who wear them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. With a difference of not more than 1 cent on a shoe, I do not think it will be reduced to the consumer.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Can not they reduce the price of boots and shoes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course they can; but I do not think they will.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Does the gentleman from Alabama claim that there is a trust on boots and shoes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Will not the ordinary competition reduce the price of boots and shoes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think it will, because shoes are sold in sizes. They sell a dollar shoe, a dollar and a quarter shoe, a dollar and a half shoe, a \$2 shoe, and the price goes on a jump of 25 cents at a time. I believe that the cent difference that goes into the shoes will not be affected by free hides. I believe that the cent difference will not cut any figure in the price of boots and shoes to the consumer; that they will sell them at the same old rates.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. But that is an assumption on the part of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is my belief. The shoe men say that if we will give them free hides it will reduce the cost, but I do not believe it will, and I believe that every dollar of revenue that we take away from the Government will go into their pockets and stay there.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia. Some who have been making a claim that the price of shoes will be reduced by reason of free hides have abandoned that argument and are now setting up the claim that while that may not be the case, free hides will enable them to put a better quality of material into their boots and shoes at the same price. I would like to have the views of the gentleman on that point.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think that is entirely with the maker of the shoe. I think he can put a better quality of stock into the shoes now, or he can neglect to put in a better quality. I think it will depend entirely on the man and the price. I do not think a man who wants to do business and drive it down to the last cent will put a better quality of stock into his product. I think there are some manufacturers who want to exploit their goods as high-grade manufactures that will try and improve their product as much as possible. But in the end, I do not believe that the American people are going to get one cent of benefit out of the fact that the Government gives this \$3,000,000 to the boot and shoe manufacturers.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman think it will prevent them from using paper bottoms and paper soles, as a great many of them do now? [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not.

Mr. BYRD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRD. Regarding the drawback proposition, will the gentleman from Alabama explain to me what is meant by this section 29, which provides:

On the exportation of articles manufactured or produced in the United States either in whole or in part of imported materials, or from domestic materials of equal quantity and productive manufacturing quality and value, such question to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, there shall be allowed a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid on the imported materials used, or where domestic materials are used, to the duties paid on the equivalent of imported materials, less the legal deduction of 1 per cent.

Do I understand by that that a man when he makes goods for export out of domestic materials can go to the Treasury and draw back the amount of the duty he would have had to pay had he imported them?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand the proposition, it simply enlarges the present drawback clause. Originally, if you brought a foreign commodity into the country and manufactured it and shipped the manufactured product out, you got 99 per cent of your duty back. Now, if you bring a foreign commodity into the country under this bill and afterwards ship a manufactured commodity out, even if it is made of domestic material, but of the same class of goods and out of the same material as that you imported, at any time within three years you can go to the Treasury Department and get 99 per cent of the duty that you paid.

Mr. BYRD. Will the gentleman answer one other question? If that be true, is it not then a possibility for the manufacturer to get back out of the Treasury all of the duty that he pays on all the imported raw material that he gets?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Unquestionably. There is no reason in the world why any manufacturer, if this Payne bill goes through, should lose any part of the duty that he pays on raw material he brings in here and manufactures for reshipment, except the 1 per cent that the Treasury takes out to cover the cost to the Government.

Mr. BATES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. BATES. I am interested to know the views of the gentleman from Alabama. The gentleman is opposed to free raw material?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is in favor, therefore, of reducing the tariff rate on manufactured goods?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am in favor of putting everything on a revenue rate.

Mr. BATES. Or, in the words the gentleman used a moment ago, reducing them to a competitive basis?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly. They could not be at a revenue rate without their being on a competitive basis.

Mr. BATES. Precisely. Now, is the gentleman in favor of that, notwithstanding the fact that it would reduce the number of jobs for workmen in this country, or else reduce their wages? Is the gentleman in favor of reducing the wages of the American workman?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I am not in favor of reducing the wages of the American workman, and if the industries of this country are put on a healthy competitive basis, when hard times come, when panics come, the workman of this country will hold his job, and foreign goods will cease to come in; but when you build this protective tariff wall so high that the American people have got to buy every commodity and all they desire in times of great prosperity and great development alone from American manufacturers, you expand conditions, develop your business to such an extent that when hard times come there is no place to retrench or dispose of your surplus production, and you have got to shut up your factories at home. But if you build up the great industries of the country, not with an unhealthy, hothouse growth, but along conservative lines, recognizing fair competition and only revenue rates of duty all the time, while you might not build your industries as rapidly as under a forcing process, yet you would not have the present unhealthy growth, and when hard times and panics come and it is necessary to reduce production, the foreign goods would be driven out; in most cases American mills would continue in operation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, it is as simple as that two and two make four that if we reduce the duty on manufactured iron and woolen and cotton goods, larger imports will come to our shores and there will be less of those goods manufactured in this country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, of course I do not deny that. I have not denied it.

Mr. BATES. And the gentleman can not deny the point that John Bright admitted in 1886, when he said that only two things could happen from reducing the tariff rates; one was the reduction in the price of labor, and the other was the closing of mills.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is not any question that at the high rate of development that your hothouse growth has carried the manufacturing interests of this country to, when times become hard and competition becomes severe somebody has got to go out of business; but if you had developed it along safe and sound lines, not under stilted conditions, when you meet these days of depression it would not be the American laborer who went out of business, but it would be the foreign workman.

Mr. BATES. I beg the gentleman's pardon—I do not want to interrupt the gentleman—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to go on with my argument.

Mr. BATES. Just one more question. Take the subject of knit goods. There is now some disappointment and criticism because the rate has been raised on knit goods or hosiery, is there not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I think there is.

Mr. BATES. In spite of our present rate, which is rather high, is it not a fact that there have been large importations all along for the last twelve years, and that only last year there were 61,000,000 pairs of foreign hosiery admitted into this country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman will clearly find that on almost every woolen schedule the duty is practically prohibitive. A seemingly large quantity may come in, but it is very small in comparison with the amount of the American consumption, but I think there are some classes of hosiery that we do not manufacture here that are imported, and there are other classes of hosiery that some American people prefer to buy abroad and would not buy here anyhow; you can not keep them out no matter what the tax amounts to—it is the clothing of the idle rich; they are willing to pay any price for the latest styles.

Mr. WEISSE. Will the gentleman from Alabama please allow me to just ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania one question?

Mr. BATES. With the permission of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it is just a question, I will, but I desire to get on with my speech.

Mr. WEISSE. In 1900 the average wage paid, according to the census report, in the woolen mills of this country was \$350 a year for each person who worked there; also the average wage to the carpenter and mason was about \$6 a day, or about four times as much. Was the carpenter protected by the tariff, and why is it wages were so low in the woolen industries? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BATES. Why, that is easy to answer. The carpenter is the head of a family, a skilled workman, and the wage cited does not include helpers and journeymen; in the woolen industry there is much unskilled labor, and women and children work. I do not think there is much sequence in the citation made by the gentleman, and his statement as to the low wages in the woolen mills does not conform with the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama who yielded to him, who states that we have been hothousing American labor in the supply of woollens and cotton and forcing up the rate of wages, thereby prohibiting imports by foreign manufacturers. It does not accord with the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. The carpenter has absolutely no competition from abroad and very little at home. The woolen and textile workers have a certain degree of competition, else we would not be now importing the large amounts we do from abroad.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The wage scales show we have been very far from hothousing American labor in the textile industries. I know of some instances where the present system has been starving them.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, before that statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin goes into the Record I would like to know what is his proof as to carpenters' wages.

Mr. WEISSE. From the census reports of 1900, in regard to labor in woolen mills.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not desire gentlemen to interrupt me for the purpose of asking other gentlemen questions.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. COLE. Is it not a fact that the carpenter is absolutely protected? Can a carpenter working on a building in London compete with a carpenter working on a building in Washington?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I will not stop to go into that proposition now. I think that the legislation passed by Republican Congresses in the past has clearly demonstrated that, so far as foreign labor coming in here, there is no law on the statute books that protects American labor against the importation of foreign labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now I desire to get back to the line of my argument.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield for a further question? The gentleman from Wisconsin—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will have to ask the gentleman if he will please, in his own time, discuss the question with the gentleman from Wisconsin—not in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama declines to yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not wish to be impolite or discourteous; I do not intend to be so, but I desire to go on with my argument, and the continued interruptions are preventing me from doing so. As far as the condition of the country is concerned, affecting men out of employment, we have reached this lamentable situation through the hothouse growth caused by a prohibitive protective tariff, and a panic has been produced as the natural result; men are out of employment under the protective system, and not under a revenue system. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now I want to say this further about this question of free raw material: The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] as-

serted that he believed in the doctrine of free raw material. As I have shown you all, the free raw material that he has given anybody he has given to New England and the Atlantic seaboard, but we did have something on the free list before this bill was written, and that is zinc ore. Zinc ore has been admitted free. There is zinc ore produced in Mexico, running from 32 to 40 per cent of metallic zinc. There is a 60 per cent zinc ore produced at Joplin, Mo. The freight rate from Mexico on the zinc ore to the smelters amounts to \$6.50 a ton. The freight rate from Joplin to the smelter amounts to a dollar. The Joplin ore is a 60 per cent ore, the Mexican ore is only about a 32 per cent ore as a rule. Now, you will see that it is evident from that statement that it costs more to bring the Mexican ore to the mill in Kansas or in Missouri than it does the domestic ore, and the only reason it is imported is that the zinc mines of Joplin and in western Missouri have not been able to produce enough zinc ore to supply the demands of the smelters.

That being the condition, we might expect if any taxes were levied they would be on a revenue basis, that would produce some revenue. That I would most cheerfully vote for; but they propose a tariff that will amount to from \$7.50 to \$8 a ton on zinc ore. That will be prohibitive, and put the Mexican ore entirely out of business in this country and allow the American ore to be raised to the difference in price, which ultimately must be paid by the American consumer. And every man who uses galvanized-iron and barbed-wire fencing must ultimately pay this increased tax, levied for the producer and not for the Government.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman made a remark a minute ago that the only thing in this bill was giving free raw material to New England.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I did not say it was the only thing in this bill.

Mr. HILL. I mean relating to raw material. I have heard a good deal about that in the last three months. Will the gentleman kindly specify one free raw material that this bill gives to New England as distinct from any other part of the country?

A MEMBER. Hides.

Mr. HILL. The bulk of the shoes of the United States today are made outside of New England, and it is no boon to us any more than it is to you. Name some other.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said New England and the eastern seaboard.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman said free ore. There is not a blast furnace in New England which will take advantage of foreign free ore.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; but the blast furnaces of the eastern seaboard are close to New England. I said New England and the eastern seaboard.

Mr. HILL. Now, the gentleman in his remarks a moment ago said New England.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If I left out the eastern seaboard and New York in one statement, I have said it enough in my speech to classify the two together. As to hides, New England gets the benefit of the hides, they get the benefit of cheaper ore, they get the benefit of the coal. The free coal shipped will go to New England, and she will be nearly the sole beneficiary from it.

Mr. HILL. Was the gentleman present at the hearing when the hide question was before the committee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. HILL. Does he not know that New Orleans, Richmond, Va.; St. Louis—where the largest shoe factory in the United States is located—Minneapolis, Cincinnati, and all of the West and South were represented and demanded that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Then, why charge it up to New England?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will tell you. The free hides may go, to some extent, to the interior points, but they go largely to New England and the East. And I will tell the gentleman why. The interest that the shoe man in the interior has in New England getting free hides is because it does not make as much competition for the hides that he buys in Chicago and in the interior points from American farmers, and that is why he wants New England to have free hides.

Mr. HILL. Does not the gentleman know, when he speaks of competition with Chicago, that it was demonstrated before the committee that the tanners of this country could not buy hides in Chicago; that the "big four" were tanning their own hides; and that the tanners could get no raw materials to work with, and had to have free hides or go out of business? Now, the gentleman knows that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It may apply to some rate war that the tanners were engaged in, but it did not apply to the shoe-makers in getting free hides, and that was what I was talking about. I was talking about the shoes.

Mr. KELIHER. A moment ago I understood the gentleman to say that, in his opinion, the duty on hides added but 1 cent a pair to the cost of shoes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was variously estimated in the committee by different witnesses. Some went higher and some went lower. I think some placed it at half a cent and some went up materially higher. I said in my judgment that it would not amount to more than 1 cent.

Mr. KELIHER. Now, will the gentleman permit me for just a second to pit against his opinion the opinion of William L. Douglas, one of the largest and most successful manufacturers of shoes in the world, who said very recently:

The hide duty adds about 7 cents per pair to the cost of producing the grade of shoes I manufacture.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that where the high-grade shoe is being manufactured out of all sole leather it would amount to more than 1 cent a shoe; but the shoe that the poor people wear, that the ordinary people wear, which is not all manufactured out of sole leather, it will amount to very little, and therefore I say that it will not on the average amount to a cent a shoe.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman was interrupted a moment ago he had instanced coal as having been put on the free list and to be of benefit to New England. If the gentleman has not concluded his remarks on that subject, I would be very glad if he would continue them as to that particular article.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As to coal, I admit that it is somewhat on a different basis to the other raw material given to New England. The manufacturer of New England will receive a great boon from free coal. I admit that the plain people in the New England States will also receive a boon from free coal which they do not receive with reference to these other raw materials that are given to them. But I do say this: Coal is on a revenue basis. It is paying a large amount of money into the Treasury. The people of my State have to pay high taxes on woolen goods and cotton goods that are manufactured in New England. They have to pay a high tax on agricultural implements that are manufactured in New York; and why is it not just that in equalizing these burdens the people of New York and of New England should pay some tax on the coal that they import for their own benefit? It is equitable in the fair distribution of the burdens of taxation, and from a revenue standpoint there is no reason why they should not bear their share of the burden.

Now, I am taking up a great deal more time than I intended, and I wish to hurry on through my speech.

The next item that I come to in the bill—

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. Before the gentleman leaves the zinc matter I would like to ask him a question: As I understood the gentleman he stated that the district of Joplin was unable to produce sufficient zinc ore for the necessities of the country.

Now, is it not a fact that when the spelter men first went to Mexico to purchase Mexican ores there was a surplus of zinc ores in the United States, and the only reason they went to Mexico was because they could get those ores cheaper on account of the price of labor, they employing peon labor, as against the high price of labor paid in this country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all. They went there because they could not get the ore in Joplin. They went there because the demand in the United States for ore increased so greatly that this country was unable to supply it. Now, in 1898 the Joplin district produced 235,123 tons of ore; in 1907, nearly ten years afterwards, the Joplin district only produced 297,126 tons of ore, or an increase of 26 per cent in your production of ore. But in 1898 the spelter production in the United States—and I will say that spelter is the pig metal that is produced out of zinc ore—the spelter production in the United States amounted to only 114,104 tons, whereas in 1907 the spelter production had increased to 249,612 tons, or an increase of 119 per cent. Now, your increase of ore in the Joplin district in that time was only 26 per cent, and the consumption of spelter by the smelters of the country increased 119 per cent, and that is why they had to go to Mexico to get more ore. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. Is it not a fact that the increased amount of spelter over the amount of ore commenced in 1905, the year that the spelter men went to Mexico to buy their ore? And is it not true that the production of zinc ore kept pace with the demand for spelter until they went to Mexico, and the reason it fell off in our district was because of the fact that these men who were engaged in that business went to Mexico simply so they could buy it cheaper on account of the cheap labor that was employed in mining it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not allow the gentleman to make a speech in my time; but I will say to the gentleman the reason he has not had prosperity in his district is the very same reason that we have not had it in the balance of the country, because we have had too much of the Dingley tariff. [Applause.] I want to say this to the gentleman, that when he talks about the cost of this zinc ore to the American people they had to go abroad to get foreign ores because of the great demand of the American market. The importation of zinc ores into the United States in 1907 amounted to \$2,419 tons. If charged an average duty of \$7.50, as proposed by this bill, it will amount to \$618,000 that the American people will have to pay.

Now, I do not mean to say that I would not favor a fair revenue duty, something like a dollar a ton, two and one-half times as much as there is on iron ore; but there is no reason for putting a duty of \$7.50 or \$8 a ton on zinc ore and putting iron ore—now at 40 cents a ton—on the free list. But I will say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MORGAN], he has one distinction in this Congress, and always will have. I understood the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who represents the Danville district in Congress, to say yesterday that when he went to Joplin he told those people there that if they sent a Republican to Congress they would get a tariff on zinc ore, or he would vote for a tariff on zinc; which, in the organization of the House, I take it, meant that a tariff on zinc ore was sure to come; that if they sent a Democrat to this House they would not get any tariff on zinc. And I want to tell the gentleman who obtained his election by reason of the Speaker's promise that putting that tariff on zinc ore will cost the American people \$618,000 a year, and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MORGAN], whom I am facing, will have the great distinction of being the highest-priced Congressman that the American people ever paid for. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. I want to ask one question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will ask me a question, but not make an argument.

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. I will not inject any speech. I think Speaker CANNON can take care of himself in regard to what he said at Joplin.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. The question is this: Do you believe that by permitting the spelter people to go to Mexico and buy cheap Mexican ore that will reduce the price of their spelter to the consumers one cent?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, let me tell you what is the fact in reference to that, and the record shows it, that the only reason any ore came in from Mexico was because the Joplin district could not produce enough to supply the demand.

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. You are mistaken on that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And if it is left alone, the Joplin district will go on supplying the demand until the country needs more than Joplin can furnish, and then it will go to Mexico. Now I desire to go on without interruption, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. You have not answered the question about the increased cost to the consumers.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The testimony shows that Joplin ore can be furnished and laid down at the smelter cheaper than the Mexican ore can be, if you believe the testimony before the committee.

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I know what the testimony was.

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. I know what the facts are.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Your witnesses came before the committee and compared the ore of Mexico with the ore of Joplin, and said that they had a \$9 ore in Mexico with \$6.50 freight rate, and \$20 ore in Joplin; but they did not say that that Mexican ore was a 32 per cent ore and that the Joplin ore was a 60 per cent ore, and that made the difference, and made the metallic substance in the Joplin ore higher and the ore cheaper than the Mexican ore. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. Is it not true that the Committee on Ways and Means were furnished with the exact facts, that the Joplin ore was 60 per cent and the Mexican ore about 40 per cent? I do not suppose that all the men that went before the committee stated that, but was not that stated so that the gentleman understood and based his action upon it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It ran from 32 to 40 per cent, and the best-informed men that I found before the committee stated that it was 32 per cent.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman has said that the reason Mexican ore came in was because the mines of the Missouri district could not furnish the zinc ore. It was stated before the committee at the hearings that at the very time the Mexican ore

was coming in, the bins in the Joplin district were full of zinc ore for which there could be found no market, because it could not be produced at the price for which the Mexican ore was sold. Now, that was a statement of fact, and we ought to be able to reach some certain conclusion about such a matter. Does the gentleman deny that fact?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there is no doubt about the statement that the Joplin people had an overproduction of ore about the time that the panic struck the country and everything shut down, but that was not the normal condition and will not continue to be the normal condition, I hope. I understand that shortly after the panic occurred the ores in the Joplin district were being consumed and used, and that the stock of ore is not there now.

Mr. GAINES. If my colleague will permit me again, that does not address itself precisely to what I said. The gentleman says there was a panic and that there was less than the usual demand for everything. That is not what I am addressing myself to. It was stated time and again in our hearing, and upon oath, not that there was no demand for zinc ore, but that while the Mexican ore was coming in and there was a demand for Mexican ore the Missouri ore lay in the bins and could not be sold because the price fixed by the Mexican ore was less than the Missouri cost of production. Is that true or not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I say there was some testimony that the ore accumulated in Joplin. It accumulated at the time of the bank panic of 1907—

Mr. GAINES. My question is whether the gentleman disputes the fact, or does he brush it aside and refuse to give it consideration?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, I will answer the gentleman in my own language. I stated before, and I state it again, that there was testimony that a quantity of ore had accumulated in the bins at Joplin, and that it was at the time of the panic when everything shut down. I do say, and the gentleman can not deny these figures, that the cost of ore in Mexico is \$9, as testified to by these witnesses, and the cost of freight to the smelter is \$6.50; and the cost of ore at Joplin was placed at \$20 and the cost of the smelter \$1, and that the Joplin ore was 60 per cent ore—most of the witnesses testifying that the Mexican ore was 32 per cent ore, and some said 40—but, taking it at 40 per cent, the gentleman only needs a pencil and a paper to demonstrate the fact that the Joplin ore was cheaper at the smelter than the Mexican ore because it had more metallic zinc in it, and the cost price of the Mexican ore was not the cause of its importation.

Mr. GAINES. I am aware that we are trespassing on the time of the gentleman from Alabama and getting in a good deal of stuff in his speech which perhaps will break up the continuity of it, and I really apologize for the interruption, but the gentleman says that I can not deny the figures. That is very little to the point, because I have no personal information about the matter, nor does the gentleman from Alabama have such personal knowledge, but the figures furnished us were by persons who swore to the figures and knew what they were testifying about. Now, I want to bring the gentleman back to that question: Is it or not a fact that at the very time these Joplin ores could not be sold, because the price was below the cost of production, Mexican ores were sold to the zinc trust?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know whether the latter statement is true or not. It may have been a fact that the smelters in times of prosperity, before the panic of 1897, might have made a contract for zinc ores that had to be carried out, and their contract did not expire until after the period when Joplin had quit mining on account of the panic.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman from Alabama permit me to make a short statement?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. In looking over the hearings bearing on this production of ore in Mexico, I was struck by the statement made—by whom I do not recall, but absolutely inaccurate as to the cost of mining in Mexico. I want to premise my statement by saying that I have no interest in the production of zinc, never did have, have no friends who do produce it that I know of, and that I am wholly disinterested in it. I have had some experience in mining in other lines and other metals in Mexico, and I know that the most ordinary miners' wages in Mexico are twice, and two and a half, and frequently three and four times as much as was stated in these hearings. The peon labor, which seems to have a mysterious meaning for the gentleman, is the ordinary labor of the miners, and it commands much better wages and they do very much less work per unit than it does in the United States; but, after all, the lower wages paid to

Mexican miners is very little cheaper and often not so cheap as the higher wages paid in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, if gentlemen will allow me to proceed, I wish to come to the prohibitive rates in this bill. I am not sure that I am absolutely correct in the statement I am about to make, but I took the report filed by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee and counted the number of increases made in the bill. If I counted correctly—and I think I counted about right—they had increased the rates in 46 instances. The reductions made, as set out in the report, if I have counted them correctly, amount to 165 items.

Now, of those items, 49 are in the chemical schedule, 50 in the metal schedule, which makes 109, and leaves only about 65 items of reduction in the entire balance of the Payne bill below the rates in the Dingley bill. Now, when you consider the fact that the Payne bill has 712 paragraphs, and it is stated—I do not know how correctly, but I believe it to be a fact—that the bill has 4,000 items in it, you can see what a small reduction has been made in this bill under the rates of the Dingley bill.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman ought to be fair—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to be fair.

Mr. HILL (continuing). And show at the same time how many items there are on the free list, and then devise some way by which these could be reduced in order to make his statement fair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, the items on the free list out of the 4,000 will not cut a very large figure with the items on the protective list.

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes; they will cut a very large figure. The gentleman said 712 paragraphs. How many of them are in the free list?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not a large proportion of them.

Mr. HILL. Of course those can not be reduced.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will state how many there are, I will take his statement for it.

Mr. HILL. I am not making the statement.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite catch what the gentleman from Alabama said as to the number of paragraphs in which duties were reduced.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not say as to the number of paragraphs. I said I simply took the report and counted the number of places in which the majority stated in the report reductions were made, and I count 165. I may have made a miscount of a figure or two, but that is substantially what is stated in the gentleman's own report of the number of places in which reductions have been made.

Mr. LONGWORTH. One hundred and sixty-five?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. One hundred and sixty-five.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The fact is that 130 paragraphs were reduced, not considering the number of brackets, and only 30 paragraphs were raised.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman enumerates 46 in his report, as I understood it. I will take him at his own figures—that 30 have been raised and 130 reduced. My figures are somewhat in excess of that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is, out of four hundred and sixty odd paragraphs which carry a duty in the Dingley bill, but that does not include the free list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman sustains my argument. He states that 130 out of the entire bill have been reduced.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Those are paragraphs, not brackets. It is the commodities contained in 130 paragraphs. In other words, this bill reduces more than 30 per cent of all the paragraphs and increases less than 6 per cent of the paragraphs.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will take the gentleman's statement. He had three months in which to prepare a bill and to write a report; we had four days in which to examine it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to answer the question which the gentleman asked me, if he desires an answer at this time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, I can not talk to two gentlemen at the same time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman and I agree on a good many things in this bill. I also agree with a good many of the views advanced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the leader of the minority. The trouble is that I have not an opportunity to hear all of the views of the minority of the committee. May I ask the gentleman why, when he had equal opportunities with the majority in the hearings, having all the information possessed by the majority, having all the various

divisions of the Government at their command for information, the minority of this committee did not draft a complete bill, that we might be acquainted with their views in their entirety?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from Ohio know whether or not the minority has drafted a complete bill?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I should think, if they had, they would have produced it or put it in their report. The very statement that the minority make is that they have had no opportunity to criticize this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will permit me, what the minority say is not that they have not had an opportunity to study the question thoroughly. They have studied it thoroughly; but they say they had only four days in which to study the Payne bill, the bill containing 4,000 items and 712 paragraphs, each requiring accurate mathematical calculation in every instance to determine what has been done. No set of men on the face of the earth could run over it in four days and come to an accurate understanding of all that has been done. Now, as to whether we propose to offer a bill, we will answer that proposition when the bill is taken up under the rule of the House that allows us to offer amendments.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will, then, only ask the gentleman this question, Have the minority prepared a bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I really would like to have the gentleman from Ohio candidly tell me whether it is the intention of the majority members of this committee to give the membership of this House an opportunity to fairly offer amendments to this bill, or whether they propose to put the gag rule to us? If he would answer that, he would give me some very valuable information.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will answer the gentleman by saying that I am only one-twelfth of the majority of that committee, and can not speak for them.

Mr. JAMES. "Why don't you speak for yourself, John?" [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will inform me as to his views on that proposition, it may afford some light on the views of his colleagues.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman does not need it in view of the fact he has power now under the rules of the House to move the recommitment of the bill with instructions. He does not need assistance from this side. I would like to answer the question he asked some time ago—

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] has stated that he is one-twelfth of that side and one-twelfth added to our side would enable us to carry a proposition. Now, if we could get an answer from him as to how he stands on this and if he is with us we would be very glad to have the information.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I will candidly say I hope that a reasonable opportunity for amendments will be given, one that will not delay unduly the passage of this bill.

Mr. JAMES. Is that only a hope?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Now, I ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], inasmuch as I have answered for myself, if he will answer for himself as to whether the minority of the committee has prepared a complete bill or, if they have not, whether they intend to prepare one?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not prepared to answer the question as to whether the minority has prepared a complete bill or not at this time. The gentleman will receive his answer when the proper time comes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the gentleman is one-seventh of the minority—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, we will answer that—

Mr. LONGWORTH. And has the advantage of me in that respect.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, we will answer that proposition when we come to it. If we are given opportunity to offer amendments, we will offer such amendments as we think necessary to reduce this bill to a revenue basis. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then the gentleman's answer to my question is that the minority have not prepared a bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I have not answered the question; I decline to answer.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman has an opportunity to offer amendments, will the gentleman then vote for the bill when it is amended?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman very candidly that if I can amend this bill I will amend it—

Mr. HILL. To suit yourself.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (continuing). From the chemical schedule to the last schedule in the bill and put it on a revenue basis, or even if I can put a small portion of the bill on a revenue

basis I would most cheerfully vote for it, but because we put in one amendment here and another amendment there, and still leave it in the form of the old Dingley bill, with its prohibitive rates, I can assure the gentleman it will not get my vote under any circumstances. There are some paragraphs now on a revenue basis, but not many; the exception proves the rule.

Mr. HILL. I would ask the gentleman what he means by putting it on a revenue basis. What would a revenue basis be on pig iron and steel?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am coming to that.

Mr. HILL. I did not know but what the gentleman had already discussed that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I have been trying to come to the pig-iron schedule for some time. I will say this in reference to the pig-iron schedule, there is a great deal of testimony about what it costs to make pig iron here and what it costs to make it abroad.

I have heard it variously estimated by interested witnesses who came before the committee that pig iron was being made abroad all the way from eight to twelve dollars a ton, and that they estimated the cost of making pig iron at home at from twelve to fifteen dollars a ton. The freight rates have been stated at most remarkable figures, but there is some testimony that I think is reliable. The Government sent an expert to Germany to investigate the cost of making pig iron. He testified that the cheapest pig iron that was made in Germany was at a cost of \$11.42 a ton in the Luxemburg district. He testified that it costs \$1.49 freight to haul that pig iron to Antwerp for shipment abroad, and I think that the average ocean-freight rate must have been somewhere from one dollar to one dollar and a half a ton. Now, from the best information I can obtain, the cost of production of pig iron in England is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$11 a ton, and the freight rate varies from \$2 to \$3 a ton. Judge Gary in his testimony before the committee stated that the average freight cost of bringing pig iron from the foreign furnaces to the American seaboard was \$2.85. Now, as to the cost of making pig iron in this country, I do not think there is a doubt that pig iron can be made in the Birmingham district cheaper than it can be made anywhere else in the world. But the Birmingham district lies to the west. Our markets are protected by the domestic freight rate against foreign competition. We consume 75 per cent of our production of pig iron at home.

The question of a tariff on pig iron is not a matter, it seems to me, that would seriously embarrass the producer of pig iron in the Birmingham district, and I do not think it would be fair to try the case on the cost of production in the Birmingham district.

The real point of competition for pig iron lies between the Allegheny Mountains on the west and the Atlantic seaboard on the east. Wherever foreign iron comes into this country and tries to pass beyond that territory, the domestic freight rate is so heavy that in itself it acts as a prohibitive tariff. Judge Gary testified that at Pittsburgh the United States Steel Corporation was making iron at \$12 a ton with all the advantages that the United States Steel Company has in owning its own lines of transportation, its own mines, and its magnificent furnaces, and that \$12 a ton absolutely excluded all profit. But he testified that it was costing the independent producer about \$2 a ton more to produce pig iron than it was the United States Steel Corporation, which would make the cost to the independent producer about \$14 a ton. I think that is about a fair estimate. I believe although the United States Steel Corporation is making iron at a less rate, that the independent furnaces located between the Atlantic seaboard and the Allegheny Mountains are making pig iron at about \$14 a ton, and that the domestic freight rate from Pittsburg to New York is \$2.50 a ton.

Now, if you take the \$11.42 for German iron and add \$2.85 freight rate on it, you will see that the present reduction by the Ways and Means Committee of the duty on pig iron to \$2.50 per ton is near a revenue rate. I believe myself that that is about right. Pig iron, when it had \$4 a ton on it, produced more revenue in proportion to the amount of the product than any other item in the iron and steel schedule. I believe that the present reduction to \$2.50 has placed pig iron on a fair revenue basis, as far as I can estimate it; and if the gentlemen on the committee had pursued their reductions as successfully as they did on pig iron and iron pipe, which they put on about a revenue basis, they would have done very well.

Now, in the adjustment of these tariff schedules, of course the raw material ought to be the lowest in the amount of duty charged, the next degree of manufacture a little higher, and so on up to the finished product. In order that it can be a fairly revenue rate it must be adjusted very carefully in refer-

ence to every detail. Its adjustment ought to be made as carefully as you would adjust the works of a handsome watch, but when I look at this iron and steel schedule and the changes that my colleagues have made in presenting the bill to this House it looks to me very much like it had been adjusted by a blind man with an ax.

There is no homogeneity to it, either from a revenue standpoint or from a protective standpoint. Let me call your attention to one item here where they made a reduction. That is, round iron and steel wire, not smaller than 13 wire gauge. Under the Dingley bill it was $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and under the Payne bill it is reduced to 1 cent a pound. And the gentlemen pride themselves on this reduction. Under the Dingley bill the amount of the American production of that class of iron, as shown by the census report filed with the Ways and Means Committee, amounted to \$61,840,000. And the imports for 1905, comparing the same year that the census was taken, amounted to only \$496,000, or a percentage of imports, as compared to the American consumption, of five-sixths of 1 per cent. Less than 1 per cent was being imported of the production of this article, a prohibitive duty, raising little revenue; and the gentlemen reduce it from $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents to 1 cent, or a reduction of one-fourth of a cent.

The majority of the committee in their report say that—

While duties should be protective, they should be adjusted as nearly as possible to represent the difference in cost of production at home and abroad.

That is what they say; and yet they only reduce this duty on round iron and steel wire one-quarter of a cent.

Now, I want to call attention to a piece of the testimony that was before the committee on this particular item. Judge Gary, when he returned his testimony to the Ways and Means Committee, accompanied it with an affidavit of a Mr. J. A. Ferrell. Mr. Ferrell stated that he was one of the employees of the United States Steel Corporation; that he had traveled all over Europe; that he was familiar with the cost of iron and steel at home and abroad, and he knew the freight rates at home and knew the freight rates abroad, and he had made up a table of how much it cost to produce at home and abroad. He said that pig iron abroad cost \$8.75, and fixed the cost of pig iron at home at \$15.30, when Judge Gary fixed the actual cost, eliminating all profits, at \$12. So you can see that Mr. Ferrell in his testimony was giving the doubt as to the low cost to the foreigner and the high cost to the American consumer all through his statement; and yet I find that in his statement he said this:

That wire, No. 018 steel wire, 13 gauge, cost in the United States \$33.98 a ton, and the freight rate to the Atlantic seaboard, fixing the point of competition at New York, was \$3.58, making the cost, with the freight added, \$37.56 a ton at New York.

He said that the cost of the product in Germany was \$23.70, the freight rate \$3.25 to New York, making the cost price \$26.95; the new duty would be \$22.40; the old duty would be in excess of that by a quarter of a cent a pound, making the cost of the German product in the harbor of New York \$49.35. He estimated the English product the same way, and with duty fixed by the Payne bill added it would be \$51.10, thus making a difference in favor of American wire in the harbor of New York of \$11.79 as against the German wire, and \$18.54 as against the English wire. The committee say that they have cut this bill to a point where they equalize the difference in cost abroad and at home, and yet they still leave the duty high enough to make a difference of \$11.75 a ton in one case and \$13.54 in the other.

I say that in that instance the committee has not come any way near a revenue rate. In the case of pig iron and iron pipe they have come to a revenue rate. There are many other instances in the iron and steel schedule where they still leave the rates prohibitive. In the case of steel rails, although they have cut it half in two, I do not think there is anything in the testimony that justifies the conclusion that there will be any more steel rails imported under the new rate than under the old rate.

I want to call attention to the manner in which another change is made in the iron and steel schedule. In arranging the rates of duty all will admit that the lower grade of manufactures should bear a less rate of duty than the higher. The committee in its wisdom has seen fit to cut steel rails from seven-twentieths of a cent a pound to seven-fortieths of a cent a pound; and yet when they come to billets, out of which steel rails are made, and it costs \$3.22 to convert a billet into a steel rail, the lowest duty they put on billets is the same rate as they put on steel rails; and from the low grade they go on up, so that the average rate of duty put on steel billets is a higher rate of duty than they put on steel rails. If seven-fortieths of a cent a pound is a fair rate for steel rails, unquestionably it must be too high for steel billets. Can anybody deny that? It is in this way they have written the iron schedule from be-

ginning to end. In some places they have a fair revenue rate and in other places they have taken the revenue out of the government pocket and given it to the manufacturer by putting something on the free list, and in other cases they have left the old prohibitive rates of the Dingley bill.

The iron and steel schedule as presented to the House in the Payne bill, to properly balance it and make it a homogeneous whole, should be changed in its entirety.

Now, there are one or two other matters to which I desire to call the attention of the committee, on other schedules, and then I will close. The lemon growers of California came before the committee and stated that they wanted the duty raised on lemons. The examination of those witnesses disclosed the fact that they had an absolutely prohibitive duty at 1 cent a pound on lemons from California to the Allegheny Mountains; that there was not a foreign lemon could be sold in all that vast territory, because when the foreign lemon started westward the freight rates stopped it at the Allegheny Mountains, and it could not come any farther in competition with the California lemon. But they wanted a rate that would let the California lemon come to the city of New York and shut out the foreign lemon. They admitted that they had this prohibitive duty from the Allegheny Mountains to the Pacific Ocean; 90,000,000 people consuming lemons, and they had a prohibitive market for 60,000,000 of those people, but they wanted a prohibitive rate for the other 30,000,000. They wanted to make the man who lives in New York City or along the eastern seaboard buy the California lemon whether he wanted to or not, and make him pay an additional rate in order to do so.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I will ask my colleague to state if he has investigated to what extent the competition in lemon growing has been removed by reason of the great calamity in the destruction of the lemon groves by earthquakes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my friend from Texas that I have not investigated that question.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That was done before this bill was introduced.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have not investigated that question and can not fully answer it, but I have no doubt that this competition was destroyed to a large extent. But whether it has been so destroyed or not, I do say that these California lemon growers are asking for and have obtained a tax rate in this bill that will destroy competition with them.

It costs \$13.20 to haul pig iron from Birmingham to San Francisco. It costs \$7.50 to haul it from Liverpool. So these people in California think that Congress would be justified in putting a tax of \$6.70 on pig iron in addition to the present duty; that is, so that Alabama furnaces could cross the Great Divide with their pig metal and force the people of San Francisco to buy from them and eliminate the advantage of the ocean freight rates that they enjoyed?

I would not demand it, and I think they would rise in arms if anybody suggested it; but they come before the American people and say they are entitled to exploit the entire American market and make the American citizen in New York pay an additional quarter of a cent a pound for lemons, in order that they may enjoy the benefits of a prohibitive tariff throughout the United States, and the Ways and Means Committee have given it to them in this bill.

That is the way this bill has been reduced in the interest of the consumer, by putting prohibitive tariffs on what the people of the United States need in their everyday life. Why, take the woolen schedule. I will not consider it all. There is only one reduction that has been made in that schedule; that is on tops; otherwise the old Dingley rates stand. I want to call your attention to just one paragraph as a fair illustration of the wool schedule. That is paragraph 307 of the Dingley bill and 375 of the Payne bill, both paragraphs being identical in their wording. Under this paragraph the duty on that class of blankets and flannels varies from 22 cents a pound and 30 per cent ad valorem added to 33 cents a pound and 40 per cent ad valorem added. In other words, the ad valorem rate runs all the way from 95 per cent to 130 per cent.

Now, the amount of American imports of this article, as shown by the census of 1905, was \$19,719, and the amount of the American production of those articles was \$24,620,000. In other words, the imports coming into this country of flannels and blankets amount to only eight one-hundredths of 1 per cent. At the same time these manufacturers of blankets are exporting into foreign countries, paying the freight and competing abroad, to the extent of \$81,000. Now, here is an article of prime necessity in the life of the American people, a necessity that in the cold climate of the North they are bound to have, warm flannels and warm blankets. With a protective tariff duty levied of from 95 to 130 per cent, with a prohibitive rate of duty under

the Dingley bill, producing no revenue to speak of, with an empty Treasury, no change is made, protected beyond the entire cost of production, no relief is given the American consumer and no revenue to the Government.

The more you study the paragraphs of this bill the more you come to the conclusion that the bill has been rewritten and revised in the interest of the manufacturers of the United States, not in the interest of the Treasury, and not in the interest of the consuming masses of the people.

They have placed raw material on the free list, thereby taking millions of dollars out of the Federal Treasury to put in the manufacturers' pockets. To make up the deficit that could be made up by a fair reduction of the present duties to a revenue basis, they put additional taxes on the American people by a duty levied on coffee and tea.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman said that he believed in a revenue tariff; would he put a tax on tea and coffee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would put a tax on tea and coffee if it was necessary to obtain revenue to run the Government. But I say to the gentleman that in levying a revenue tariff where you can levy it on structural material, such as iron, steel, lumber, and glass, the burden of your taxes falls more heavily on wealth than it does on poverty, because the poor man may buy a plow, but the rich man builds the skyscraper building, or builds a railroad.

Mr. PARSONS. The poor man has to travel on the railroads.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When you consider lumber and glass, it is the same way—the distribution of the tax falls more heavily on wealth. When you consider clothing, there is still some difference, as the poor man does not buy as fine a suit of clothes as the rich man, and the burden of taxation is somewhat distributed; but when you put the burden of taxation on articles of food, you bring it down absolutely to a per capita tax. The poor man drinks as much coffee as the rich one, and the plow-boy eats as much meat as the farmer. There is no distinction between man and man; and when you put the tax on tea and coffee and meat you put a direct per capita tax on the masses of the American people and make no effort whatever to distribute the burden of taxation so that it may fall more heavily on wealth than it will on poverty. [Applause.] Therefore I say that if I were writing a tariff bill I would endeavor to levy the tax so that it would fall on wealth as far as possible and exempt poverty to the fullest extent I could. For that reason the last place I would levy a revenue tax would be on tea and coffee and the necessities of life. [Continued applause.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the bill pending for consideration is not a perfect measure. There never has been an absolutely perfect tariff law in this or any other country. Bills of this character are peculiarly the result of compromises. I am sure there is not a single member of the committee that prepared the bill who would not make a number of changes in it if he could have his own way about it. After a laborious investigation, running a period of over four months, the Ways and Means Committee agreed upon the measure which it has submitted to the House for consideration, and I have no doubt it will receive the support of every Republican member of that committee. If every Member of this body should refuse to support any measure that did not conform to his ideas in every particular there would be very little legislation of general importance. Therefore, at the outset of my remarks, I ask each Member of the House to carefully analyze the bill and determine for himself whether it is a substantial improvement over the existing law; whether it has a substantial preponderance of merit, taken as a whole. If it has, I feel justified in asking its cordial support. In my judgment it is a great improvement over the present law.

THE NEED OF REVISION.

The Dingley Act was the first measure I voted for after becoming a Member of this body. I believed then it was a very wise measure, both from the standpoint of revenue and protection, and I still believe it was well adapted to the conditions that prevailed at that time. The Government required revenue and the country needed protection, and both were given in abundance. But since the enactment of that law great changes have taken place in industrial and commercial conditions not only in this country but throughout the civilized world. The policy of revising the tariff and adjusting schedules to meet the changed conditions was approved by practically all the people of the United States at the last general election. Among the chief commendatory features of this bill is that which puts certain crude raw materials used in the manufactures on the free list and materially reduces the duties on others. This

is an important step in the right direction and bespeaks a hopeful and helpful rationalization of our tariff policy. It foreshadows a broad industrial policy for this country, based upon sound economic grounds. The Republican party, of course, believes in the policy of protection to American industries, and it has no compunction in maintaining that Congress has the constitutional right in levying impost duties to discriminate with a view to industrial development. But the policy of protection should be a rational one, and it should be so directed as to bring about the greatest increase of opportunities for the employment of capital and labor. An indiscriminate imposition of duties upon all articles that are or might be produced in the United States without regard to their effect upon the industrial policy of the country as a whole is not only unscientific, but is a positive menace to real progress. The object of protection is to stimulate domestic industries along natural lines where the resources of the country are capable of supplying the entire domestic demand, thereby creating home competition and securing to the people the comforts and necessities of life at stable and reasonable prices. Customs duties that are not levied in harmony with this principle are not logical protective duties. There may be exceptions to this rule, where it is important, even under great natural disadvantages, for the Government to protect industries and develop the production of articles that are necessary to the national defense in times of war.

Duties imposed for the purpose of protection should tend to advance the welfare of the whole people. It is not the policy of protection to simply surround special interests with conditions under which they may make increased profits. Neither should it be the object of protection to simply increase the price of commodities. In all lines where we have as great natural advantages as any other country we are justified in imposing a sufficient duty upon foreign commodities to encourage the establishment and maintenance of home industries; but where, in any event, we would be required to produce under great natural disadvantages as compared with other countries, the effect of the protective policy would be to unnecessarily and inordinately increase the price of the product, and the result would be a positive injury to the country as a whole. If in any particular line of industry our capacity to produce can not be reasonably developed to such an extent as to supply the demands of our people, that line of industry does not fall within the philosophy of protection. When a substantial portion of the needs of the country must be supplied by imported products the price of the domestic product is always that of the imported article plus the duty. There is no doubt as to who pays the duty under those conditions.

CONSUMERS MUST BE PROTECTED AS WELL AS PRODUCERS.

With these preliminary observations outlining my view of the philosophy of protection, the first question logically relates to the rates of duty that ought to be imposed upon imported articles for the fair and reasonable protection of American industries. The national Republican platform of 1908 declared that the tariff ought to be sufficient only to cover the difference in cost of production in this country and in foreign countries, securing a reasonable profit to the producer. This is an ideal principle. It would give the American producer practical control of the American market, and at the same time protect the people against unjust and inordinate prices as the result of combinations to restrain trade and create monopoly. If tariff schedules could be adjusted and maintained accurately upon the line embodied in the Republican platform, the moment domestic production in a given line went under the control of a combination and prices were raised unduly commodities could be profitably imported from foreign countries, and the effect of the monopoly would be practically destroyed. The difficulty is in making a practical application of that principle, because of the constant fluctuations in the cost of production here and abroad. A tariff that might exactly cover the difference in cost this year might contain many inequalities and incongruities in a year from now. Therefore, the best that Congress can do is to adopt schedules sufficiently large to cover the difference of cost under normal conditions, and I believe in making the duties liberal enough to cover all exigencies that may be reasonably foreseen.

PROTECTION AND TRUSTS.

There ought to be no unnecessary duties. Protective duties should not be unnecessarily high. When the Dingley law was enacted the people of the United States felt little or no concern about monopoly or the suppression of competition on the part of great industrial combinations. The chief concern of the makers of that law was to fix protective duties high enough to take care of American industries under all conditions, with the view that in shutting out foreign competition healthy competition would be created at home. Since that time the problem of industrial

combination has become a serious one in our affairs, and it is now as necessary to protect the people of this country against imposition by trusts and monopolies at home as it is to protect legitimate industries from disastrous competition from abroad. This can only be effectively done by eliminating all unnecessary duties. This is the essence of the tariff doctrine contained in the Chicago platform. It means protection both ways—protection to American industries and protection to American consumers, and both of these objects should be constantly kept in mind in framing a new tariff law. Where an industry has made such development that it can produce commodities as cheaply as any other country in the world, it requires no protection and should have none. There is no difference of cost between production here and abroad, in that instance, upon which to base a protective duty under the doctrine of the Chicago platform. This principle has been recognized by the Republican party in years past. A number of years ago there was a duty on copper ore and copper ingots. Our natural advantages along the line of copper production exceeded those of any other country, and the industry, under the stimulus of the tariff, so developed that copper could be produced more cheaply in the United States than anywhere else in the world. Therefore, the Dingley law put copper ore and copper ingots entirely upon the free list. This is a concrete illustration of Republican interpretation of the protective policy.

It is often charged that a protective tariff creates trusts. Trusts are combinations growing out of the passion of avarice, and they are created to stifle competition and increase profits. Under this definition they are all bad and violate a wise public policy. When a trust becomes good, it is no longer a trust. All combinations are not trusts. Trusts exist in free-trade countries as well as in countries that maintain protective tariffs. The chief difference is that in a free-trade country there is no tariff behind which a combination can find shelter in increasing prices unjustly and imposing upon the people, while in a protection country, if the tariff is higher than is necessary to cover the difference in cost of production, combinations may degenerate into trusts and raise prices clear to the top of the protection wall with entire safety. This illustrates the importance of keeping duties down to a reasonable protective basis.

RELATION OF PROTECTION TO LABOR.

The vital purpose of a protective tariff is to increase opportunities for the employment of capital and labor in the development of the natural resources. The rate of wages and the standard of living in this country are higher than in any other country in the civilized world, and it is, and always has been, the policy of the Republican party to maintain conditions under which the great army of intelligent and independent wage-earners will be able to maintain a high standard of living, such as will enable them to provide well for themselves and their families, and, by industry and frugality, to lay by a fair competence against the exigencies of age. This policy is necessary to the permanent progress of our country. Every honest, industrious, frugal toiler in this land ought to be able to earn enough money to establish and own a home, rear a family with all of the advantages that American society affords in the way of comforts, education, and culture, and provide for all the reasonable requirements of life. The object of government is not merely to encourage the accumulation of wealth, but its prime purpose is to promote the building up of a strong, intelligent, self-reliant manhood and womanhood. [Applause.] Wealth is perhaps the greatest factor in promoting that end, but it is not the end. It is only a means. The leaders, industrial and political, for the next generation are being nurtured at this time, not in the palaces of luxury, but in the virtuous homes of the middle class and the wage-earners of the country, and it is of the greatest importance that the children in these homes shall be surrounded with conditions that will give them an opportunity to make the highest and the best development of the faculties with which they are endowed. The wages of labor, like all prices and values, tend to seek a common level. If there was no protection to American labor, the level of wages in this country would inevitably gravitate to the level of wages in foreign countries. A protective tariff operates like a dam in a river. The water level above the dam is kept at a higher stage than the level below it, but take the dam away and the water will find a common level. The level below the dam will not rise to that above, but the level above will inevitably recede to that below. If the tariff policy that has been maintained in this country for so many years, and which has so greatly blessed and benefited American labor, should be abolished, the rate of wages and the standard of living in this country would become the same as in European countries. I am unalterably opposed to any policy that will tend to reduce the high standard of wages and living that now prevail in the United States.

RELATION OF MACHINERY TO COST OF PRODUCTION.

But, notwithstanding the high scale of wages that is paid in this country, we can successfully compete with the entire civilized world in many lines of production. To begin with, we have the greatest market of any country on earth. The 90,000,000 people in the United States have a consuming capacity equal to that of almost half the entire population of the globe. There is absolutely free and unfettered commercial intercourse among all this great population. It should be our policy wherever we can reasonably do so, to provide for all the demands of our own people. In addition to supplying our own markets with the products of the factory and the farm, we should seek markets abroad along lines where our industries are capable of the greatest expansion. The natural resources of the United States in many lines, if equaled, are not excelled by any country in the world; and where machinery is a large factor in production we are able to overcome the high price of labor and produce as cheaply as any foreign country. Conditions are such here that the capacity and efficiency of labor can be increased in a greater degree by machinery than in any foreign country. Where production is largely the result of handwork, the United States is at a serious disadvantage with its foreign competitors, and in those lines we can not hope to develop a large foreign sale for commodities, but must be content to produce chiefly for home consumption.

But where machinery is the chief factor in production we can excel our competitors in many lines, because of the stupendous magnitude of our output. The consuming capacity of the United States is such as to justify—more than that, to require—the employment of the greatest amount of machinery possible. No other country in the civilized world has anything like as large an exclusive market as the American producer has. Production here is carried on upon such an enormous scale with the use of powerful machinery that the high rate of wages is more than compensated for in the increased productive capacity that labor is given. At the town of Gary, in the State of Indiana, the United States Steel Corporation has recently completed a rolling mill that is capable of turning out 40,000 tons of rails or structural steel a month. The operation of that mill requires only four men. Divided into shifts of eight hours each, it requires only 12 men to keep it running continuously. It is being operated day and night, week in and week out, month in and month out, upon the same type of steel, and there is a ready market in this country for every pound of steel produced at a good price. There is no such rolling mill in any other country in the civilized world. The immediate labor cost of rolling steel at the Gary mill does not exceed 20 cents a ton. No foreign country can establish and operate such a mill as that, because it does not have the market. A 5,000-ton order of steel rails or structural steel is a large order for an English rolling mill, and the change of model in rails and structural steel and the change of machinery from one order to another brings about loss of time at a serious cost; and while the wages paid laborers at the Gary mill are fully twice as high as they are in any other country, the labor cost of rolling in that mill is cheaper than in any mill in the world. There are a number of steel and iron establishments in this country that manufacture on a large scale. Such institutions as those of Jones & Laughlin, the Cambria Steel Company, the Lackawanna Steel Company, and the Bethlehem Iron and Steel Company are looked upon here as modest concerns, and yet there is no establishment in Europe or in any other foreign country that produces as large an output as any one of these, with the single exception of the Krupp establishment in Germany, which is devoting its attention now chiefly to the manufacture of armor plate and armament.

FREE RAW MATERIALS.

Wherever we have at least equal natural advantages, and by the large use of machinery can produce upon such a stupendous scale as the markets of the United States require, there is a prospect of extending our sales along those lines into the neutral markets of the world, and it should be the policy of the Government to create such fundamental conditions as to promote an increasing foreign trade. There are a number of lines of American production that are capable of large expansion, and I believe that raw materials for manufacture along such lines should be admitted into this country free of duty. The theory of the free raw material doctrine is that it promotes the greatest development of industries and gives the greatest opportunities for the employment of capital and labor, and, therefore, is of the highest benefit to the country as a whole. Duties upon raw materials are a handicap upon the American manufacturer for the export trade. They operate to protect his foreign competitor in the neutral markets by seriously increasing his cost of production. When I speak of materials in this connection I have in mind such crude materials as iron ore,

copper ore, coal, coke, lumber, and hides, materials that require relatively a small amount of labor in their production. It is contended with great force and plausibility that the producer of raw materials should be protected as fully as the manufacturer of the finished commodity; that the finished product of one man is often the raw material of another. This claim contravenes a vital principle in the policy of protection, and that is that protective duties should not be imposed as a matter of right for the special benefit of any class of citizens or any particular interests, but they can only be justified when they promote the welfare of the country as a whole. There is no vested right in a protective duty, and it is never justified simply to advance a special interest. Wherever and whenever there can be a larger development of industries by the policy of free raw materials than there could otherwise be, that policy should be unhesitatingly established. A duty upon a raw material that is largely the basis of manufactures might stimulate its production here and give employment to hundreds of our citizens, and at the same time it might so handicap the manufacturer of the completed product as to disable him from competition in open markets and thereby deprive thousands of employment who would otherwise have it.

It is a most unwise policy to impose a duty upon crude products for the purpose of giving employment to hundreds of men when its imposition would deny employment to thousands. In my judgment, the rule in such situations should be to do that which will result in the greatest development and the highest opportunities for the employment of capital and labor. There is no great producing country in the world, except the United States, that does not give its manufacturers the benefit of free raw materials. That policy is sanctioned by the wisdom of experience. The ores, coal, coke, lumber, hides, and all of the crude things that enter largely into production are admitted free of duty in every country in the world excepting this. In iron and steel production we have a tariff on coal and coke and limestone and the ferro alloys that are used in their manufacture, and, notwithstanding these handicaps, our iron industries have made gratifying progress in the world's markets. Only last week the public press noted the fact that Charles M. Schwab, that great genius of steel and iron production, who is now at the head of the Bethlehem Steel Company, in open contest upon quality and price took from all competitors the contract to construct two large modern battle ships for the Argentine Republic. His proposal was \$20,000,000—about \$3,000,000 below that of any other competitor. Let us no longer live in a fool's paradise and impose duties without discrimination. Do not shackle our industrial Gulliver with numerous Lilliputian bands until he is helpless and hopeless away from home, but strip him and give him a chance to make a place for himself in the industrial world. Allow him to develop his capacity and multiply opportunities for the American wage-earner to supply a greater share of the world's markets as well as to provide for our own. "Loose him and let him go."

This bill is a large move in the right direction. It puts a number of crude raw materials upon the undutiable list and reduces the duties upon others, and I predict, if it shall be enacted into law, that in a number of lines of production America will dominate the neutral markets of the world.

EFFECT OF DUTY ON HIDES UPON THE MANUFACTURES OF LEATHER.

The experience of the United States in the manufacture of leather and leather products is interesting and instructive. The present law imposes a duty of 15 per cent upon cattle hides imported into this country. For twenty-five years before the enactment of that law hides were altogether on the free list, and the Dingley bill, as it passed the House, provided that they should be admitted without duty. The Senate put a 15 per cent rate upon them, and the amendment was agreed to by the House. While hides were free of duty finishers and manufacturers of leather in this country established trade all over Europe and in many other countries, and American leather and manufactures of leather secured a reputation for excellence that was not enjoyed by producers in any other country. Prior to the duty on hides there were large imports of raw hides from South America and other countries. They were tanned and manufactured into leather and leather products and sold abroad very largely. The effect of the duty has been to drive South American hides from the United States to France and Germany and other European countries which admit them free of duty, and to increase opportunities for employment of capital and labor in those countries at the expense of our own.

From the year 1902 to 1906, both inclusive, the increase of imports of cattle hides in Germany was \$7,000,000 pounds; in France \$2,000,000 pounds, while the increase in this country was only 3,000,000 pounds. Germany increased her importations 52 per cent, France 32 per cent, and the United States

only 2½ per cent. This was the effect of our 15 per cent duty on hides. It took away from American capital and labor the opportunity to manufacture a large share of the great volume of hides into leather and leather products, and who was benefited by it?

Does the tariff on hides stimulate their production? Nobody claims that it does. Would there be any fewer cattle grown in this country if hides were free of duty? Nobody claims there would be. Does the duty on hides increase the opportunity for the employment of capital? If so, where? I make the assertion that the duty on hides has not created a demand for a single dollar of additional capital. It has not created employment for a single additional laborer, but it has increased the cost of shoes for the wage-earner and his family. The sole effect of the duty is to increase the price, and to drive from the country a large volume of hides that would otherwise come here and be manufactured into leather and leather products by American capital and labor. The cattle growers' association is insisting upon the maintenance of the duty on the ground that it makes cattle growing more profitable. It is claimed on the other hand that the cattle grower gets no benefit from the duty, but that it is entirely absorbed by the beef packers and the leather trust. For the purpose of my argument it is a matter of indifference where the increase in price goes, but it is likely, however, that it is distributed among the growers, the packers, and the leather producers. It is demonstrable that the direct effect of the duty is to deprive American capital and labor of the opportunity of manufacturing large quantities of hides that would be imported from South America and other countries. Those opportunities have been transferred to Europe. It was stated in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means that the exports of oak-tanned sole leather from the United States, which were large under free hides, have fallen off one-half since the imposition of the duty.

DOES THE DUTY ON HIDES BENEFIT THE FARMER?

The average farmer will derive more direct benefit in the decreased cost of boots, shoes, harnesses, and other leather products he is compelled to buy than he now derives from the tariff on cattle hides. It should be kept in mind that calfskins are duty free under the Dingley law. The large cattle feeders may receive some benefit from the tariff, but it is at the expense of the millions of consumers of leather products. The American farmers have uniformly stood against the protection of special interests at the expense of the many. They favor a tariff policy that will build up industries and give employment to labor at good wages. The duty on hides merely increases the cost of one of the necessities of life. It does not build up or encourage a single industry or furnish employment to a single laboring man. It has no foundation in justice or public policy.

The duty on hides is indefensible from any standpoint. It not only does no good, but it does a great amount of industrial harm. It is a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy. It has driven from our country a large amount of work in the manufacture of leather that would otherwise have come here. In addition to that, it has increased the cost of leather to our manufacturers of shoes, harness, and other products, and has handicapped those manufacturers in the foreign markets. Its result has been to protect the foreign producer of shoes and other leather manufacturers against American competition. Notwithstanding this increased disadvantage, our foreign shoe trade amounts to upward of \$10,000,000 a year. It has shown a substantial increase even under the hide tariff. Our total export trade in leather and manufactures of leather amounts to \$45,000,000 a year. If our manufacturers of leather were put upon an equal footing with their foreign competitors in respect to material they could pay the high rate of wages prevailing in the United States and excel all foreign competitors in the open markets of the world. Instead of selling \$10,000,000 worth of boots and shoes abroad a year, with proper conditions, they could sell a hundred millions. Instead of exporting leather and its products to the amount of \$45,000,000 a year, they could easily expand the trade to \$200,000,000, and thereby greatly advance the interests of all our people. The manufacture of leather and its products is one of the lines in which, with proper conditions, we can dominate the markets of the civilized world. The stupendous volume of production, the large use of machinery, and other advantages enables the American manufacturer to pay American wages and still make his product at a cheaper labor cost than his foreign competitor. Our manufacturers of leather now are being threatened by the imposition of foreign tariffs. They are fettered by duties, unnecessary and illogical, upon the raw material at home. Their condition is that of one who enters a foot race with a ball and chain about his ankle, in so far as the export trade is concerned. Give the industry a chance to grow

and develop. Let it show to the world what it can do if it is upon an equal footing with other countries. It can overcome the difference in wages, but it can not overcome that and other obstacles like the duty on hides and all of the tanning extracts and other materials affecting the cost of production.

INDUSTRIES CAPABLE OF LARGE EXPANSION.

This policy applies to a number of other lines of production, which, if placed upon an equal footing with foreign competitors with respect to materials, could well afford to pay the high scale of American wages and still become important factors in the open markets. This is true in some classes of iron and steel, in machinery, agricultural implements, locomotives, railroad cars, furniture, common cotton fabrics, copper and its products, and, perhaps, others. Is it not the policy of wisdom to so adjust tariff duties as to allow these great industries to expand and conquer foreign markets? It is not necessary to surrender our home market to do this. We only need to allow certain crude materials that are the basis of manufacture to enter our ports free of duty, and in respect to articles that are of general consumption our home demand will require the largest possible use of machinery resulting in enormous production, with high wages, at a low labor cost. [Applause.]

The principle is one for the general good. It involves the question as to which policy will bring about the greatest industrial development in a given line of production. When that question is settled there is but one thing to do. It is demonstrated that our leather manufacturers, upon an equal footing with foreigners in respect to materials, have the ability to invade the open markets of the world. Is it not the part of wisdom to give that great industry every opportunity to expand its foreign trade? Would it not be to the advantage of the people of the whole country for it to do so? Wherever the opportunities for labor are increased, the tendency is to higher wages, and labor is vitally interested in the embodiment of a broad industrial policy in our tariff laws.

What is the advantage of subsidizing merchant ships to promote foreign trade and at the same time maintaining a policy at home that operates powerfully against it? The nation that can offer the best bargains in the neutral markets of the world is the nation that will establish and maintain commercial supremacy. What good would it do to carry American products to neutral markets in American bottoms and be unable to sell them when they are delivered except at a loss?

HOW TO EXPAND SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

We are anxious to promote trade with South American countries, and yet we have made small headway in those markets with our manufactures. The United States is the only great manufacturing country in the Western Hemisphere. All the other countries, with their marvelous natural resources, are engaged mainly in the production of raw materials for manufacturing. They send their materials abroad and bring back the finished product. We buy coffee, wool, hides, and chemicals from South America for our own consumption, but how much of the finished product do we return in exchange for the materials? Ships laden with our necessities come to us from South American ports, carry products from this country to European countries, and transport merchandise from Europe to South America, hence the marine triangle that is so conspicuous in the commerce of the Atlantic. It is a natural triangle created by the inexorable laws of trade. A subsidized line of American ships to South America will not affect it materially. We can not hope to supply South America with food products, for she produces them as abundantly as we do. Our only hope is to invade her ports with our manufactures, and that we can only do successfully when we become able to offer as good bargains in price and quality as any competitor can offer. We sell farm implements and other machinery there now, because we can meet the conditions. But South American raw materials, in the main, go to the hives of industry in Europe because they can get better returns in finished product than they can from this country. South American materials are welcomed in European ports, where they are absolutely free of charge, while in this country they are burdened with substantial tariffs. Is it not the part of wisdom to admit materials into our ports free of duty to be made into finished products in our factories and sold back to those countries? That is exactly what this bill proposes respecting hides and some other things. That is the only way to destroy the marine triangle and conquer South American markets. This policy does not mean the surrender of our home market; it means its complete protection and its unlimited expansion. It means the establishment of more industries, the employment of more laborers earning high American wages to buy and consume the products of the American factory and farm. It means the expansion of foreign sales of American manufacturers.

In his last address to the American people, on September 5, 1901, President McKinley said:

Our capacity to produce has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention. *Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more.* In these times of marvelous business energy and gain we ought to be looking to the future, strengthening the weak places in our industrial and commercial systems, that we may be ready for any storm or strain.

What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions and thereby make a greater demand for home labor. [Applause.]

Notwithstanding the handicaps upon American manufacturers for the export trade, their productive efficiency and natural advantages have been so great that our exports of manufactures amount to nearly \$500,000,000 a year, an increase of about 130 per cent since the Dingley law went into operation. With a wise tariff policy the exports can still be greatly increased. A small element of cost often determines who will make a sale in an open market. Profits in foreign markets where there is stiff competition are small as a rule, and a relatively small item of increased cost in manufacture may be sufficient to put an industry out of reckoning. We send abroad many raw materials and bring back the finished product. Our raw materials find a free and welcome market in foreign countries. On the other hand, most of the crude materials imported for our large industries are burdened with substantial duties at our ports. The imposition of such duties is justified in behalf of American labor in some instances. Any duty that advances the interests of the American workingman, in my judgment, is justified. I have already expressed my firm adherence to the policy that will maintain a high standard of wages and living as an essential factor in American social and economic life, but the imposition of duties upon crude raw materials may so disable industries as to prevent them from that large and healthy expansion they would otherwise be capable of, and thereby limit and circumscribe the opportunities labor would otherwise enjoy. Many blunders and worse things have been made in the name of labor.

The policy I am advocating is not free trade. It is not tariff for revenue only, but it is protection in its broadest and most enlightened sense. It is the kind of protection that, while preserving the home market for the American manufacturer, will open foreign markets as well, and thereby multiply the opportunities for the employment of capital and labor. The farmers are vitally interested in increased markets for their products, and a policy that would greatly increase the exportation of manufactured commodities would result largely to the benefit of the farmers, because it would correspondingly increase the number of laborers earning good American wages who would buy and consume the products of the farm. It would be to the advantage of the farmer to supply the laborers with food here rather than abroad, because here he has a monopoly of supplying them, while abroad he would meet competition from all countries. It would be especially beneficial to farmers respecting the multiplied millions of dollars' worth of perishable food products grown annually that can not be exported advantageously. I believe in protecting the home market for the American producer where he can supply our own needs without insuperable natural disadvantages, though he can not hope to send products abroad. It is an essential part of the Republican policy of protection to build up American industries that are capable of supplying the American markets, thereby establishing industrial communities all over the country and diversifying industries. This is justifiable even in lines where we have equal natural advantages with foreign nations, but where labor is such an element of cost as to put us at a disadvantage. The protective policy has a number of notable achievements to its credit along that line, such as the manufacture of silk, tin plate, wire nails, pearl buttons, and cotton and woolen fabrics. These industries are entitled to protection as well as those that are capable of large expansion in the export trade. This bill will do much in the direction of providing free iron ore, free coal, and free hides, and substantially reducing the tariff on lead, lumber, and other things.

An instance of the extent to which the protective policy has been disadvantageously extended is respecting extracts for the tanning of leather. Years ago there was a bountiful supply of oak, hemlock, and other timbers in this country, so that our tanners obtained tanning extracts of the very best quality at low cost. The scarcity of timber in recent years has been such as to deprive them of this source of supply, and they are now importing large quantities of woods and extracts from tropical countries. The present law imposes duties on tanning extracts high enough to enable American extract makers to import logs from South America and make the extract here. It requires

4 tons of wood to make 1 ton of extract, and we have a tariff high enough on the extract to enable American producers to pay the cost of handling and the freight 15,000 miles on 4 tons of logs to get 1 ton of extract. The tanning industry has to bear that burden. The payment of the cost of handling and freight for 15,000 miles on 4 tons in order to get 1 ton to market seems to me a most unbusinesslike proposition. That is an extreme case, and yet it illustrates the principle upon which some of our tariffs are laid upon raw materials.

DRAWBACKS.

The pending bill very materially liberalizes the drawback provision of the Dingley law. Under that law a manufacturer who imports material that enters into his product may export that product and receive from the Government 99 per cent of the duty he paid upon the imported material; but it is necessary in order to receive the drawback to show that the identical material that was imported entered into the manufacture of the exported article. The ordinary manufacturer in this country produces with a view to selling in any market. In order to obtain any advantage under the drawback provision of the present law it is necessary to keep a separate account of the imported material and segregate the commodities into which it goes. Very few of our manufacturers can afford to do that. It is only the very large industries that can do so. The Standard Oil Company, in making tin cans for the exportation of petroleum products, has a sufficient trade to justify an establishment exclusively for that trade, and it imports large quantities of tin plate from Wales and obtains the full benefit of the drawback. The International Harvester Company, a combination of a large number of concerns, imports material to use in the manufacture of farm implements, but it has one or two establishments engaged in manufacturing for the foreign trade exclusively, and it has no difficulty in securing the benefit of the drawback provision. The ordinary manufacturer, who produces for the trade generally in a single establishment, secures little or no benefit from it, because he can not tell when he makes a particular article to whom he will sell it. That provision is broadened in the pending bill so that a manufacturer who imports material to use in a finished product need not keep track of the identical material, but will receive the drawback upon exported products containing material of the same quality and productive value as that imported. It will greatly enable our manufacturers to take advantage of the drawback provision. It brings its benefits within the reach of thousands of producers who are not able to avail themselves of it under the present law and will tend largely to increase export trade.

But the drawback provision, liberalized as it is in this bill, will of itself afford only partial relief. Many of the crude materials are not produced in sufficient quantities in this country to satisfy the requirements of our manufacturers, and when that is the case the price of the domestic material is increased to the price of the imported material with the duty added. This is the case with hides, raw wool, lead, and a number of other articles. Most of the valuable standing timber in this country is owned by large syndicates which are able, in a measure, to fix the price of stumpage. This condition in some degree accounts for the largely increased price of lumber in recent years. The bulk of the accessible deposits of iron ore is owned or controlled by a few large corporations, and many independent producers of iron and steel are compelled to buy their ore from those corporations at constantly increasing prices. The duty upon the ferro alloys used in improving the quality of iron and steel in the process of manufacture is a substantial element in their cost. Duties upon such basic materials used in manufactures increase the cost of the finished product which can not be offset by the drawback provision, because it is impracticable to use all imported material in any line of production. The policy of taxing those materials tends to artificialize our industries and fix domestic prices at an abnormally high standard. They are stilted and unnatural and incapacitate our producers for successful competition with their foreign rivals in open markets. The tariff on the raw material is often doubled and even quadrupled in the cost of the finished product. The duty on raw wool of the first class, for instance, is 11 cents a pound. It requires 4 pounds of raw wool to make 1 pound of cloth. The duty of 11 cents on a pound of raw wool amounts to a duty of 44 cents on a pound of woolen cloth, and to that must be added successively duties to protect the spinner, the dyer, the weaver, and the fuller.

The abolition of duties on iron ore, coal, coke, hides, flax, and linseed oil, and the substantial reduction of the duties on lumber, leather, lead, and a number of other things will tend to reduce the price of those articles and decrease the cost of the finished product to the domestic consumer and to the export trade.

IRON AND STEEL.

The most substantial reduction made in any schedule of the bill is upon steel and iron in the metal schedule. The duty on steel rails is reduced from \$7 to \$3.50 a short ton; on pig iron from \$4 to \$2.50 a ton, and on other crude forms of steel and iron proportionately. Almost every item pertaining to steel and iron and their manufactures is substantially reduced. Mr. Carnegie recommended the entire abolition of the duties upon all steel and iron products, but the committee deemed it not only unwise, but positively dangerous to make such a radical change. There is much, even in the industries, in the spirit of self-reliance, and all of our steel and iron establishments have been built up under the protective system, and they feel that protection is still necessary to their maintenance. If it should be granted that our industries can produce steel and iron products as cheaply as they can be produced abroad, the entire abolition of all duties on those products, under existing conditions, would likely precipitate an industrial panic. A few of the large establishments, those that own the ore, coal, and other materials they use, and rail and water transportation lines in connection with them, might be able to get along without protection. But there is a large number of other concerns engaged in the industry that are not so fortunately situated, and they would be driven out of business under free trade. These smaller concerns are the chief competitors of the large ones, and it would be of doubtful wisdom, viewed from any standpoint, to legislate them out of existence. The reductions made on steel and iron are substantial, but reasonable, and are as much as can be safely made under existing conditions.

"TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY."

The Democratic party is the champion of the policy of what it calls "tariff for revenue only," a policy that seems to me to be a sham and a fraud. Protection is either right or it is wrong. If it is right, it should be adjusted with the view to intelligently developing American industries. Industrial discrimination is the fundamental principle in the application of the policy of protection. Tariff for revenue only means, if it means anything, the imposition of random duties upon imported products for the purpose of raising revenue, without any regard whatever to their effect upon home industries. It is more liable to paralyze industries than to foster them. It is a disastrous and indefensible policy from any standpoint it may be viewed. Every tariff established since the foundation of the Government, even the Walker tariff of 1846, made some discriminations in relation to domestic industries. A tariff for revenue only necessarily precludes any such discrimination. No nation in the civilized world maintains a policy so stupid and unscientific. It looks like a mere subterfuge to enable the opposition party, that has always combated the policy of protection, to advocate even protective duties under the guise of tariff for revenue only. There is a very strong protection sentiment in the Democratic section of the United States. Business men in all sections realize the necessity of a wise protective policy in the maintenance of prosperity; and if sufficient duties are imposed to secure the American market to the American producer, it makes little difference under what title they are imposed. They are protective in spirit and purpose just the same. No party would dare levy duties for revenue without any kind of industrial discrimination.

We can not afford to impose duties for revenue or for any other purpose where it would hamper and prevent the proper development of our industries. Let revenue be raised from duties imposed upon luxuries and from duties properly imposed for purposes of protection, and if these sources of income are not sufficient, duties should be levied upon noncompetitive articles. The tariff on sugar is a fair illustration of an illogical revenue duty. This country consumes about 3,000,000 tons of sugar annually and produces nearly one-half that amount. The duty on refined sugar is about 2 cents a pound. This duty increases the cost of the imported product to its full amount and fixes the price of the domestic product at the price of the imported product plus the duty. The duty yields a revenue of about \$55,000,000 a year, and it costs the consumers of this country, at a conservative estimate, \$110,000,000 a year. The consumers of sugar are required to pay \$2 on account of the tariff for every dollar that goes into the Federal Treasury. As a revenue-raising duty it is altogether too expensive, but it is justified on the ground of protection. Beet and cane sugar production has had great development under the Dingley tariff. The beet-sugar product last year was about 480,000 tons, and the cane-sugar product was near 400,000 tons. It is the hope of those who favor the tariff on sugar that in the course of a few years the sugar product of the United States will supply the entire domestic demand. This is the chief justification for

the tariff on sugar. Coffee is a much more logical subject for a pure revenue tariff than sugar. We import all the coffee we consume, and a duty of 5½ cents a pound would yield an annual revenue of \$55,000,000—the amount received from the sugar tariff. It would increase the cost of coffee to the amount of the duty, but every penny of increased cost would go into the Treasury, which is not the case with sugar. Both are necessities that enter into general consumption by all classes of people. Happily, the duties provided in the bill and the inheritance tax will produce all the revenue required for the ordinary expenses of the Government, and a duty on coffee is not necessary. Is the tariff for revenue only party in favor of the abolition of the duty on sugar, or do they favor the duty under the tariff for revenue only doctrine?

MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM DUTIES.

The bill establishes a dual system of duties, with maximum and minimum rates. It is the policy of the bill to accord the minimum rates to every country that gives the products of the United States as great advantages as are given the products of any other country. If any country should discriminate, either directly or indirectly, against our products, the maximum rates will be enforced against the products of that country entering our ports. It is a wise provision, and its main virtue is in the retaliatory power it contains to compel foreign countries to accord our exports the same treatment they give to those of other countries. Our foreign commercial and industrial policy ought to be that of the open door. We only ask equal consideration at the hands of foreign countries, and that we should insist upon. I have little respect for reciprocity in its narrow sense—in the sense that it is a system of international dickers under which one line of products may secure special advantages in foreign markets in consideration of a grant of special advantages to a particular line of products in return. It is illogical and unscientific and savors of "graft," which it frequently is. The broad reciprocity of treating all competitors and all producers exactly alike is the principle that this country ought to encourage as the permanent commercial policy of the civilized world.

The United States has enjoyed an era of prosperity during the last twelve years beyond that of any other country in the civilized world. There has been no such development in commerce and industry in any period in the world's history. The Dingley tariff act was a wise and judicious measure. As a revenue raiser and a prosperity producer its wisdom has been abundantly vindicated. But conditions have materially changed since its enactment, and now the expansion of our industries into the foreign trade is one of the questions that demands serious consideration at the hands of the Government. I desire to emphasize the paramount importance of creating conditions that will enable the great lines of industries in the United States that are capable of unlimited expansion to arm and equip themselves for further conquests of the neutral markets of the world. Let us put them upon the same basis with their foreign competitors, as far as we can do so by reasonable legislation. Under such a policy, with the great industrial and natural advantages we already possess, I can see no limit to our industrial achievements. I predict for this bill, if it shall be enacted into law, the sincere approval of all the people of the country who are interested only in promoting the general welfare. Following its enactment I confidently look for such a revival of industrial activity as will foreshadow another era of prosperity more splendid if possible than that which followed the enactment of the Dingley law in 1897. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. POUL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have not the time.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana have leave to finish his address, for we want to ask him some questions.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I should be glad to answer questions, but I know that if we enter upon it it will continue for an hour or more. I have already overstepped the limit of one hour fixed by the rules, and I do not believe that I ought to occupy any more time, even in answering questions, and I therefore object. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, the Payne tariff bill is a deliberate betrayal of the American people. It is a fresh illustration of the perfidy of the Republican party. It is a new evidence of the fact that effective tariff relief is impossible so long as the Republican party retains control of the American Government. It is at once the clumsiest and most impudent measure in American political history. It is a characteristic Republican reply to the prayers of the people for justice in federal taxation. It is the crowning infamy of fifty years of Republican

tariffs, signaling the supremacy of monopoly, the corruption of government, the degradation of the Republic. [Applause.]

It is a fitting sequel to the Republican platform of 1908, which declares in effect that tariff taxes must be kept so high as not only to equal the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, but to guarantee a profit to American industries. The writer of that platform was—

A lecturer so skilled in policy
That, no disparagement to Satan's cunning,
He well might read a lesson to the devil
And teach the old corrupter new temptations.

[Laughter.]

The tariff declaration in the Republican platform gives the protected interests a deed to the Treasury of the United States. The wildest socialist could not have invented a more dangerous and alluring fallacy. The Payne bill completes the delivery of the Treasury to the trusts, and the American people, unable to resist the appeals and promises of Republican leadership, a leadership buttressed with the oratory of BEVERIDGE and HUGHES, the perverted logic of ELIHU ROOT, the fulminations of ROOSEVELT, and the imposing proportions of Mr. TAFT, having endorsed the atrocious transaction at the polls, are now witnessing the violation of their confidence in this new license for unlimited pillage. Amusing, indeed, were the ponderous assurances of Mr. TAFT that the Republican party would revise the tariff downward. His volcanic predecessor realized the hopelessness of such a proposition and evaded it to the last. Is it possible that the complacent Mr. TAFT may succeed where the bifocal whirlwind that recently swept from Washington to Oyster Bay failed utterly? [Laughter.] I say to you that there is more real power in one 5-cent cigar between the iron lips of JOSEPH G. CANNON, the stand-pat leader, than in the big sticks of a whole regiment of Roosevelts and Tafts. [Laughter and applause.]

The Payne bill is from no possible viewpoint a sincere and equitable revision of the tariff. Its practical effect is to reenact or to increase the overwhelming majority of the present exorbitant rates. Of the more than 4,000 articles and classes of articles in the present tariff law, it makes only a conditional reduction as to less than 400! Excepting about 75 outright increases, it leaves the remainder unchanged to serve as a minimum scale, adding 20 per cent or more for a maximum scale. It provides for the transfer of most of the articles of importance on the free list, including hides and iron ore and coffee, to the maximum scale, adding a charge of 20 per cent ad valorem. It is so worded that on and after sixty days from the passage of the bill the maximum scale will become effective as to the majority of imported articles. It provides that on and after sixty days from its passage the maximum rates shall be charged on imports from all countries which give any other country preferential trade treatment over the United States. Most of the countries from which our imports come have special trade treaties which they can not abrogate or modify in sixty days. In any event, it is doubtful whether any country would willingly yield to so insolent and unparalleled a demand and proceed to the immediate rearrangement of commercial relations, the result of years of diligent study and negotiation, merely to placate the United States.

The Payne bill is a declaration of commercial war with all the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It announces to the nations that regardless of what their particular trade situation may be, regardless of special arrangements that may have arisen from immemorial usage and environment, the failure to give the United States every preference and advantage extended to other lands will mean the application to the commodities they may desire to send to us of our maximum rates, the highest tariff charges in the world.

The conditions imposed by the Payne bill on countries seeking the benefit of our minimum rates are impossible and monstrous. We have but to recall the fact that section 4 of the Dingley law provided a reduction of 20 per cent on all the Dingley rates as a basis for reciprocal relations in order to appreciate the consummate folly of the Payne proposal. The reciprocity of the Dingley law involved an invitation to other countries to enter into friendly negotiation for mutual concessions, concessions suggested by physical and political surroundings, by past relations, by common ambitions, by ties of blood and interest and other conditions. The distorted reciprocity of the Payne bill is a threat of retaliation in advance against all countries not so abjectly accepting our enormous minimum rates as to accord us absolutely equal treatment with nations that may give them far lower charges and many greater trade advantages than the United States. Let us remember further that the rates of the Dingley bill, which served as maximum rates in reciprocity arrangements under section 4, are as to almost all the articles the

minimum rates of the Payne bill. Let us also call to mind the fact that the maintenance of the Dingley rates literally drove the great European countries to the formation of trade agreements among themselves and the erection of retaliatory tariffs against us. The Payne bill proclaims that unless these countries admit us at once to every privilege and every favor accorded one another they will be subjected to a charge on all their exports to the United States 20 per cent higher than the offensive schedules of the Dingley law. Such a proposal gives the lie to every profession we have ever made in the interest of universal peace. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It makes this country an international braggart, whose threats and bluster fill the world with unspeakable disgust. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Furthermore, it is impossible under the Payne bill to ascertain how long a given rate will apply to a particular article. The minimum rates find automatic application whenever a nation gives us equal treatment with all others, but the moment this condition ceases the maximum rates become effective as to imports from that nation. If Germany admits us to equal advantages with all other countries, the minimum rates of the Payne bill will apply to the one hundred and thirty-one millions of imports from Germany. If France for any reason declines to do so, the maximum rates will apply to the seventy-one millions of imports from France. No one could foresee how soon these conditions might be reversed. Our tariff would oscillate with every alteration in the varying commercial relations of the world. Rumors of trade agreements in every quarter of the globe would keep our markets in perpetual unrest. The tariff situation would be one of continuous uncertainty, and business would suffer constant disturbance. Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Norway, Turkey, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Roumania, Servia, Canada, Greece, and other countries have preferential trade treaties now in force. By far the greater portion of our export and import trade is with these countries. It would defy human calculation to figure the effect of the Payne tariff bill on our trade with these countries or on the revenue arising from the various commodities involved. Confusion of the direst nature and a universal tariff war would most probably result. Again, the Payne bill provides for the speedy dissolution of all our existing commercial treaties. The sudden termination of our trade treaties with Portugal, Italy, Germany, and France, under which we are reaping distinct advantages, would entail the most serious consequence. It would mean the application of the new German maximum rates to our exports to Germany, an increase which would work untold harm to American meats and breadstuffs.

Germany is our second largest market abroad, taking every year nearly two hundred and fifty millions of the products of our factories and farms. The new German maximum rate on wheat is \$1.78 per 100 kilos, as against \$1.30 to nations with which she has treaty relations; on corn, 48 cents per 100 kilos higher than the countries making treaties with her; on wheat flour, \$1.94 higher; sausages, \$5 higher. The termination of the present arrangement with Germany would mean, moreover, the application of our maximum rates to the one hundred and thirty-one millions of imports from that country. Let us no longer harbor the delusion that Germany is dependent on the United States alone for foodstuffs. Canada and Argentina are entirely able to supply her every want in this respect. Having given us every possible advantage under the existing agreement, an agreement by which we save millions through the privilege of her minimum rates, Germany would have every cause for serious offense and open rupture in case the Payne bill, revoking the present understanding and demanding every favor accorded every other nation under penalty of almost prohibitory charges on German imports, becomes a law. Again, the Payne bill assumes that the commercial amity of any foreign nation is equally desirable with that of every other. It offers the minimum rates on the same terms to every nation in the world; to Norway, with which we have a trade of three millions, and to Great Britain, with which we have a trade approaching eight hundred millions; to Persia, with which we have a trade of less than \$200,000, and to Germany, with which we have a trade approximating three hundred and seventy-five millions; to Greece, our trade with which falls below \$100,000, and to France, with which our trade approaches two hundred millions.

The enactment of the Payne bill would paralyze what little progress we have made in the extension of our foreign trade. With our tremendous natural resources and advantages we ought to occupy a foremost place in the trade of the world. The most fundamental need of our growing country lies in the establishment of more amicable trade relations with other nations. In the shipping and the trade of the earth the position

of our country is entirely unworthy of its destiny and power. We are selling to Africa less than thirty millions of her hundred millions of annual imports; to South America, less than one hundred millions of the six hundred millions she buys each year; to Asia, not much over one hundred millions of the eleven hundred millions of her annual purchases. With two billions of minerals leaping annually from our mines, seven billions of commodities from our farms, fifteen billions of articles from our factories, production is beginning to outrun domestic consumption, and we must find markets abroad or suffocate beneath our overflowing energies. Across the pathway of the Nation's advancement stand the leaders of the Republican party, the Paynes, the Dalzells, the Aldrichs, the Tafts [applause on the Democratic side], votaries of the outworn and barbarous doctrine of high protection, the doctrine that locks up the markets of the world, the doctrine that the Federal Treasury must guarantee the profits of private industry, the doctrine that one man may permanently flourish in another's sweat, another's means, another's blood; the doctrine that dries up the springs of progress in the individual and in the State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Thus a Republic that boasts of leadership in all that contributes to the advancement and happiness of humanity has hidden its example and lowered its ideals behind the highest tariff taxes in its own history and the world's as well. Thus a Republic that preaches peace invites commercial war, the surest source of mortal combat.

It is humiliating beyond all language to observe that the American Republic, founded to contradict the tyrannies, the frenzies, and the fanaticisms of ages that are dead, is to-day the bigoted disciple of the darkest commercial fallacy of the past, the doctrine of oppressive imposts that drain the country's substance to involve at last the multitudes they starve, the few they gorge, in common ruin, the survival of that ancient mercantilism which for three centuries embroiled the European Continent in trade rivalries, assaults, reprisals, in cruel and exhausting conflicts. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Considering the bill in its domestic aspect, we are startled to note the failure to remove or to reduce the protection afforded the Standard Oil trust by the Dingley law. The countervailing paragraph on crude petroleum and its products is retained without the slightest change. The effect of this paragraph is to shield the most merciless monopoly of the time. For nearly twelve years this monopoly has flourished under the wings of the Dingley tariff. It has become one of the most tremendous agencies of corruption the world has ever known. The Payne bill leaves it firmly enthroned. To-day it towers above Presidents, Attorneys-General, courts, and laws. As to the hundreds of other trusts that menace the people's means and liberties, it should be said that the limited and illusory reductions of the Payne bill affect them in no material sense. In marked contrast to the favoritism shown the trusts, to the failure to increase the charges on alcoholic liquors, are the new taxes on tea and coffee, which fall directly on the masses.

It is true that coffee is technically on the free list. A countervailing provision is added, however, by which a tax is levied equaling any export charge exacted by countries sending us coffee. The countries from which we obtain almost all our coffee levy various export charges on this commodity. The province of Sao Paulo, in Brazil, which produces half the world's supply, has an export charge of 3 or 4 cents per pound. Thus the Payne bill not only taxes coffee, the beverage of the poor, but imposes a different rate for every country from which our coffee comes. Nothing could be further from the truth than the popular notion that the Payne bill places coffee on the free list. Equally erroneous is the popular impression as to coal, another fundamental necessity of the people. Coal is nominally on the free list, but the provision is added that it must come from a country levying no charge on coal exported from the United States. Canada, the only country from which coal could come in any considerable quantity and at such price as to afford the American people any real relief, levies a tax on our coal. The reduction on lumber and timber is of doubtful value. No one knows what preferential treaties may be made by Canada and other timber-exporting countries, or how soon such treaties might put in operation our maximum charges on these commodities. The same observation may be made as to hides and iron ore. The automatic relation between the maximum rates and foreign trade treaties involving any discrimination whatever against the United States enables us to say with truth that there is not a sincere and permanent reduction in the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Especially deplorable is the fact that the lumber tariff is left in so nebulous a shape.

Sir, I favor any measure that makes it easier for an American to build an American home. [Applause.] Not one-third of the

families in the United States, under the heartless tariff of the Republican party, now own their homes.

It is worse than mockery to call this bill a downward revision. Its only downward feature is the fact that it enables the trusts to dig farther downward into the pockets of the American people. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Having administered this Government with an extravagance that paralyzes the human imagination, a recklessness that has developed a deficit of a hundred millions, having kept in operation tariff taxes that nurture the trusts and exploit the masses, the Republican party now faces a situation from which only the most wanton duplicity can preserve it. It must pretend to revise the tariff and it must remain the sanctuary of monopoly. The result is the Payne tariff bill, double-faced and double-tongued, a lie from the first paragraph to the last. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Payne bill confirms the already historic fact that the Republican party will never make a sincere and effective reduction of the tariff. Of all American political parties the Democratic party alone has displayed sufficient justice and sufficient courage to institute a proper correction of tariff evils. Perhaps its most notable performances in this respect were the successful and thorough-going revisions of the high tariffs of 1828 and 1842.

The tolling millions have little to hope from the Republican party. The doctrine of high protection makes the laboring man its especial victim, while proclaiming him its especial beneficiary. It bases its principal claim to the support of the American people on the contention that its fundamental design is to aid the American laborer. It asserts that because foreign labor is nominally or actually cheaper than American labor foreign articles are produced at a lower cost than American articles, and that in equalizing the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, it preserves a high-wage standard here. Never was there a more fallacious proposition.

Labor is by no means the only element of production either in the United States or other countries. Raw material, fuel, and other items are also to be considered. The infinite resources of the United States, unparalleled in all the world and hardly in the genesis of their development, enable us to underproduce and undersell the globe. The superior efficiency of American labor and American machinery give the American capitalist in the last analysis greater returns on the outlay for labor than foreign capitalists, even with lower wages, may ever secure.

To say that the cost of production in foreign countries, whose resources have been subjected to the wear and waste of centuries, is lower as to articles of like excellence than in the United States, the richest, freshest, and most potential section of the earth, is to state a sophistry surpassed only by the Republican theory of protection. Under the pretext of shielding labor Republican protection has erected a range of prices enabling monopoly to ravage labor, to absorb its earnings, and to reduce its ranks to economic servitude. It is a gloomy prospect that greets the American laborer as he observes the trend of contemporary events. He sees the higher courts reversing decisions unfavorable to the trusts, affirming decisions unfavorable to labor. He sees the trust leaders controlling legislation, his own leaders under sentence to jail for devotion to him. Whenever reduction is proposed in any tariff schedule he hears the sheltered interests announce that the burden of the reduction must be borne by labor. The pay of the toilers must suffer first, the returns of capital last. The envelope of the wage-earner must ever yield to the coupon of the capitalist. He hears the leaders of the steel trust declare that lower rates on the metal schedule will be immediately reflected in lower wages. Flourishing in splendor and in plenty, the nurslings of a system surrounding them with more than imperial affluence, forgetful of the men whose naked arms have lifted them to luxury, their first and most dominant desire is to shift the burden of the slightest curtailment in the tariff from bond and dividend to wage.

Such is the animus of soulless greed, the offspring of Republican protection. Such is the vaunted friendship of the jeweled darlings of protection for the American laborer. At Denver in 1908 the laboring hosts found permanent refuge in the bosom of the Democracy. They were rejected by the Republicans at Chicago to be welcomed with open hearts by the Democrats at Denver. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This welcome exemplified the essential teaching of Democracy for the relief of oppression everywhere. I know that history sings of emperors, senators, presidents; of commanders of eloquence, of industry, and of arms; of temples, monuments, and capitolis; of wars, intrigues, crusades; of parliaments, congresses, and courts. It tells of rulers, not the ruled; of leaders, not the led. It tells of statesmen, not the masses who created them; of warriors, not the nameless myriads who died to build another's fame. It tells of pyramids, not the lowly millions who constructed them;

of palaces, not the weary hands that gave them being. It tells of captains of mighty industry, not the faces at the loom; not the muscles at the anvil and the plow; not the fingers around the throttle and the brake; not the unlaureled heroes of the furnace, the sweatshop, and the rail. But the Democracy, throwing the mantle of equal rights about the scarred shoulders of toil, gives to-day a new task to history, and bids it say that labor, labor in mine, on cliff, in factory, and field, shall have its just place in the affairs of men. [Loud and continued applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BOUTELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 2.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby granted the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol on the occasion of the removal of the remains of Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant from the present resting place, the Digges farm, in Prince George County, Md., to Arlington National Cemetery, where the remains will be reinterred, such use of the Rotunda to be for a part of one day, and to be on such day and under such supervision as may be approved by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Vice-President had appointed Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. GALLINGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Interior Department.

THE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I can not hope to compete with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] in my eloquence of speech; but I do have an ambition to contribute as many facts to the committee, at least, as he has just uttered. It has always been the cry of Democracy that you should open the markets of the United States to the manufacturers of the world. They contend now that to invite commercial war with other nations would be disastrous to American industries. That is contrary to the whole history of this Nation as a great commercial people. Never in the history of this Nation has our standard been lowered beneath that of any competing nation. The provisions of this measure relative to the maximum and minimum tariff will give us a power to compel fair treatment from the commercial nations of the earth that we do not now possess. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, we have heard much in the last few days concerning the rule under which we are to revise the tariff. It is always best when we state our case to also state the law which applies to that case. Gentlemen on the other side insist that there is a provision in the Republican platform which declares in favor of revision downward. I have searched that instrument in vain for any such declaration. It is true that during the campaign utterances of that kind were made from the public platform and the stump, but if you will examine the document carefully, no such declaration is there made. I wish to read, for the enlightenment of the committee or the gentlemen on the opposite side, the rule under which the Republican party has undertaken to revise the protective tariff:

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industry.

However, on many important schedules the duty should be lowered.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLE. I do not care to yield now. A little later I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES. But this is something right along that line.

Mr. COLE. Very well.

Mr. JAMES. Has the Payne bill been constructed on that plank of the platform?

Mr. COLE. I am going to discuss Schedule K of this measure and demonstrate to the satisfaction of this committee that that provision in the Republican platform has been complied with in every detail.

Mr. JAMES. Then I want to suggest to the gentleman that the inaugural address of Mr. Taft left off that "reasonable profit to the American manufacturer" which appears in the Republican platform of 1908.

Mr. COLE. Does the gentleman from Kentucky contend that the American manufacturer is not entitled to a profit?

Mr. JAMES. He is entitled to such a profit as he may be able to obtain with fair competition under ordinary circumstances and conditions.

Mr. COLE. And he has that competition to-day among the woolen manufacturers in the United States of America.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, the gentleman evades the question.

Mr. COLE. I must decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman evades the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has the floor and declines to yield further.

Mr. COLE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose to apply this rule of revision to Schedule K. We listened to an exhaustive treatment of Schedule K on yesterday, and it was denounced in the most vehement of language. I think that when proper study is given to the historical aspect of this schedule and applied to the bill under consideration, there is not a rate there that can not be defended on just and equitable grounds. The committee, having in mind that provision of our platform, provided a schedule of 11 cents on wool in the grease, 22 cents on washed wool, and 33 cents on scoured wool. I desire to insert in the Record sections 362 and 365, as it forms the whole foundation of Schedule K.

Section 365 of the proposed bill reads as follows:

The duty upon all wools and hair of the first class shall be 11 cents per pound, and upon all wools or hair of the second class 12 cents per pound.

Section 362 provides:

The duty on wools of the first class which shall be imported washed shall be twice the amount of the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed, and the duty on wools of the first and second classes which shall be imported scoured shall be three times the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that provision has been in the law from 1867 down to the present time, save only during the Wilson law. There was a tariff on wool from 1824 to 1894; for a period of seventy years uninterruptedly it has been on the protected list. A gentleman remarked this morning that Henry Clay was one of the first and most eloquent champions of free trade in raw materials. I invite the gentleman's attention to the great measures of 1824, 1828, and 1842 in which Henry Clay was perhaps the greatest and most effective apostle of protection. He will find that in each of those measures what they declare now to be raw material was placed upon the protected list by the work of Henry Clay.

I know not what Mr. Clay may have stated in some of his public speeches, but I do know what has been incorporated in the public statutes as a result of his services in the Federal Congress. The demand of Democracy of 1894 was: Give us free raw material and we will capture the markets of the world. Instead the world captured our markets. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have in our law to-day what is known as a "compensatory duty" on wool. It is a complicated schedule, which I desire to explain. First, I wish to prove to the committee that the ad valorem duty provided in this schedule is for the protection of the manufacturer. Second, I propose to demonstrate that the compensatory duty, the specific duty, is for the benefit of the producer of wool. Keep in mind these two important distinctions: The ad valorem duty provided in Schedule K is for the benefit of the American manufacturer; the specific compensatory duty is for the benefit of the American wool producer. Now, sir, how has the American manufacturer been treated by this measure? In 1828 the average ad valorem duty on the manufactures of wool was 43 per cent. In 1890, under the McKinley law, it was 45 per cent. Under the Wilson bill it was over 40 per cent; in the Dingley bill it was about 43 per cent. So, the measure of protection accorded to the American manufacturer of wool to-day, in comparison with the Wilson bill, is only a margin of 3 per cent. If the Democrats established the rates in the Wilson bill as a revenue producer, we have only raised those rates 3 per cent in order to protect the American manufacturer. So there certainly can be no complaint that the protection of an ad valorem character given to the American manufacturer in the Payne bill is excessive. One-half the woolen manufactories in the country closed under the operation of the Wilson law. Three per cent above the closing-down margin is not an unfair measure of protection. I shall now take up the consideration of the compensatory duty.

Mr. Chairman, I have an exhibit in here that I believe will demonstrate more clearly than any statement I could make in half an hour the reason for the specific compensatory duty.

PRINCIPLE OF THE COMPENSATORY DUTY.

What is the compensatory duty? It is an increasing rate of duty based upon shrinkage in the process of refining. A scientific schedule increases in proportion to the losses sustained in the different stages of manufacture. It is based upon the fact that it takes 3 pounds of wool in the grease to produce 1 pound

of scoured wool, and 2 pounds of wool in the grease to produce 1 pound of washed wool. Unless a pound of scoured wool is given three times the protection of a pound of wool in the grease, wool will be imported into this country in scoured condition, and just in proportion as the duty on scoured wool is below that figure will it reduce the duty or protection to the pound of wool in the grease.

First. This fact was established by an industrial commission which reported its findings to the United States Congress and became the basis of the law of 1867.

Second. Twenty-one States east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio River, including Iowa and Kentucky, produced, in 1908, 71,372,000 pounds of wool, which had a shrinkage of 48.2 per cent.

The 10 Southern States, in 1908, produced 7,849,000 pounds of wool, with a shrinkage of 40 per cent.

The remaining Western States, in 1908, produced 190,916,000 pounds, with a shrinkage of 66.4 per cent.

Seventy per cent of the wool produced in the United States has a shrinkage of over 66 per cent. The average shrinkage of all wools produced in the United States is 61 per cent.

The percentage of the world's production of wool, with a shrinkage of over 66 per cent, is greater than it is in the United States.

Yesterday, when the distinguished champion of Democracy had the floor, I submitted to him this proposition: Is it not a fact that it takes 4 pounds of wool in the grease to produce 1 pound of cloth. He said, "No, sir; no such statement as that can be sustained." My friends, we have—

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLE. I can not yield just now.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I wanted to make a correction of the gentleman's statement. The statement he made yesterday was that it took 4 pounds of wool to make a pound of cloth.

Mr. COLE. It takes 4 pounds of wool in the grease to produce a pound of cloth; it takes 3 pounds of wool in the grease to produce a pound of scoured wool; that is the statement I made. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the industrial report that was filed in the year 1866. At the head of that commission was one of the best authorities on commercial affairs in this country. Mr. Bigelow chairman of that commission, made the report upon which the compensatory duty has been fixed in the law. It was filed in the year 1866. He proved to the satisfaction of Congress the actual fact, that it takes 3 pounds of wool in the grease to produce 1 pound of scoured wool and 4 pounds of wool in the grease to produce 1 pound of cloth. Now, Mr. Chairman, if that is a fact, we can afford to base legislation upon it. We ought not to base legislation upon anything of such serious character as this schedule, except on facts. It is facts we want in this committee, not fiction and oratory. It is said that the Speaker of this House is dictatorial. There is only one supreme czar in the realm of legislation, and that czar is a fact. I want to demonstrate this fact. When I have succeeded in that the rest of this schedule is a mere matter of mathematics. You will find upon investigation that 70 per cent of the wool produced in the United States shrinks 66 per cent when it is scoured. Seventy-five per cent of the world's wool shrinks 66 per cent in a scoured condition. In other words, it takes 3 pounds of raw wool to produce 1 pound of scoured wool; 4 pounds of raw wool to produce 1 pound of cloth.

I wish to insert in the Record, Mr. Chairman, a statement that was made by Senator Sherman, of Ohio, in the United States Senate in the debates of 1890, as follows:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I will say a few words in regard to this point, because this same question will arise in many other items in these schedules as they come up.

It seems to me that the Senator from Kentucky overlooks the main facts in regard to these duplicate, triplicate, and quadruple rates upon woolen goods. He forgets—no; he does not forget it, because he is perfectly familiar with the fact—that it requires 2 pounds of ordinary wool as taken from the sheep's back to make a pound of what is called "washed wool." It takes 3 pounds of unwashed wool to make a pound of cloth. That is a fact. If the Senator disputes it, then we are all at sea; but that I believe is a conceded fact.

At any rate it is proved by every witness who came before the committee and is shown by the importers and manufacturers and all woolgrowers that it is a general simple rule which may vary in degree according to the character of the wool, the finer wool being better, that 2 pounds of unwashed wool are equivalent to 1 pound of washed wool; that 3 pounds of unwashed wool are equivalent to 1 pound of scoured wool, and that 4 pounds of unwashed wool are required to make 1 pound of cloth. That seems to be rather strange. One would wonder how this waste could occur, but it is so as a matter of fact. The grease in the unwashed wool is removed partially when it is washed, still more when it is scoured. It not only takes off all the dirt, but all the fiber of the wool. Still in the next process of manufacture, when the wool is converted into cloth, there is a waste, so that all parties have agreed to a general rule, that it requires 4 pounds of unwashed wool to make 1 pound of cloth.

That does not apply to all kinds of cloth. It only applies to the better wool. The general rule is that of good quality it requires 4 pounds of wool to produce a pound of cloth, but it does not apply to all, because in certain articles they use other substitutes for wool to the extent that they use cotton in satinetts and in some form of goods. I am not a merchant or a manufacturer or anything of the kind, and I may confound these matters, but in many classes of goods made partly of wool there is cotton and in many there are other articles. In all carpet wools there are great varieties of substitutes. Therefore, the rule does not apply to those, but in all cloths of every kind whatever, it may be said that it requires 4 pounds of wool to make 1 pound of cloth.

That is the reason of this discrimination. In regard to these cheaper wools that are provided for here at two and one-half times the rate, they are made mainly of cheap wools which bear a low rate of duty comparatively. The carpet wools are sometimes used more or less for this class of goods, and the inferior wools are used for that purpose. Still the endeavor was to equalize the number of pounds of wool that are required for a pound of cloth, because now we are dealing with cloth or wools, the manufactured articles.

In 1890 the same facts that we expect to make the basis of the law of 1909 were recognized and made the basis for the McKinley law. I think there will be no disposition upon the part of gentlemen upon the floor of this House to deny the statement that was made by Senator Sherman in 1890.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are only two ways in which we can judge and apply this rule laid down in the Republican platform. First, ascertain the elements of cost in the production of an article abroad, and then ascertain the same elements here at home. That process is almost impossible. These gentlemen who have been upon this Committee on Ways and Means have found that it is next to impossible to get the necessary information from witnesses to ascertain the exact cost of an article produced in a foreign country. I have been endeavoring for the past six months to get some reports of a reliable character from South America and Australia relative to the exact cost of the production of wool in those countries. They are on their way from Honolulu to-day, but they are not here. However, they demonstrate the fact that I have already uttered.

The other method that we have of judging of the difference between the cost abroad and the cost at home is the commercial history of that product.

I wish to call the attention of the committee for a short time to the effect of the law of 1866 upon the wool industry of the United States. Before I enter upon that proposition I wish to make one statement in advance. Some gentlemen upon the floor of this House, especially upon the opposite side, have contended for an ad valorem duty upon wool. We had an ad valorem duty upon wool in 1846 under the Walker tariff law, an ad valorem duty of 30 per cent, and during that ten years, in which there was such amazing progress, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has oftentimes said on the floor of this House, there was only 1,000,000 increase in the number of sheep, showing that an ad valorem duty, the same on wool as upon the finished product, is not sufficient to protect the American manufacturer, farmer, and producer of wool.

James G. Blaine is responsible for the statement that if this country had enforced a protective policy from 1850 to 1860, the civil war could have been prosecuted upon a specie basis. I desire to insert in the RECORD the report of the Treasury in 1866 on the ad valorem principle, which formed the basis of the great law of 1866:

REPORT UPON THE RELATIONS OF FOREIGN TRADE TO DOMESTIC INDUSTRY AND INTERNAL REVENUE.

[By Hon. Hugh McCulloch, Secretary of the Treasury.]

FEBRUARY, 1866.

Diversified industry is necessary to the prosperity of any nation. Great manufactures more than double the productive power of a country, adding to manual labor the vast results of machinery and of water and steam power.

No nation, except Great Britain, imports to the amount of 10 per cent of its consumption. The purchasing power of the people is measured by their productive power. It is proper, therefore, in the formulation of a tariff measure to consider its effect upon the question of diversified industry.

Our foreign trade, however, its advantages or disadvantages apart, is now undergoing a change which will certainly make it a worse foe to our home industry than it has ever been. This change had its origin in the ad valorem features of our recent tariff. The trade has for many years, therefore, been taking a shape which has now grown into formidable dimensions. The factories, workshops, and the workmen are now in Europe; the warehouses are in New York. Goods intended for the warehouse are invoiced at the factory cost, are entered at our custom-house at that price, the duties are largely diminished, and the evil of competition with cheap labor increased. The mischief of thus harboring a class of men whose business is to debauch or mislead our officers, to rob us of revenue and injure our domestic industry, is so apparent that they should have long since found a remedy.

These foreign agents cooperate constantly for the evasion of our revenue law. They pay inadequate taxes, they render no military service, they pay very little rent, their sympathies are all on the other side, and their business is to nullify laws pertaining to our commerce and our industries. There is no redeeming benefit to reconcile us to their presence and operation. If they realize fortunes here their money, instead of going to increase capital or aid enterprise here, is

carried to Europe to swell the volume of capital there, which is employed in overwhelming our rising industry. No country in the world is afflicted with such a multitude of commercial parasites.

It is not only necessary that the duties upon imports should be so regulated as to prevent our ports of entry from being flooded with goods not imported by our merchants, with their full knowledge of the wants of the country, but commodities sent hither by foreign manufacturers and speculators, with the double purpose of realizing a profit upon our financial position and of overwhelming our domestic industry, that industry which suffers even when threatened, which we can not afford to put in peril, much less to see overthrown, even for a year.

The experience we have had in this country of the bad working of the appraisement system as organized under existing laws and as carried out in our custom-houses should force upon us the adoption of the European methods of specific duties. No such abuses can be practiced there as now disgrace our custom-houses and defraud our Public Treasury. There revenues are raised upon specific duties, not mainly, but almost altogether. The British tariff contains 382 specifics to 131 ad valorem duties. Belgium, which is one of the richest countries of Europe in proportion to its population, a country in which the various departments of civilized industry are best blended for their mutual advancement, has 330 specifics in her tariff to 66 ad valorem duties. Our tariff has 2,439 ad valorem duties and 478 specifics. The Belgian tariff presents a feature well deserving the attention of our legislators and statesmen. It has a special schedule by which linens coming from France are charged with a specific duty until the quantity of 4,000,000 pounds weight has been imported. When the amount imported exceeds that quantity and does not exceed 6,000,000 pounds weight, the duty is increased upward of 50 per cent, and when the quantity exceeds 6,000,000 pounds weight all imported within the year is charged double the rate of the first 4,000,000 pounds. The flax manufactures of Belgium are one of the most important of its industries, and this careful and paternal Government has taken this method of saving their markets from being overwhelmed with French linens to the injury of their working classes.

Now, what was the effect of this law of 1866? In 1867 we produced 160,000,000 pounds of wool in the United States. In 1885, after seventeen or eighteen years of the application of this specific compensatory duty of 12½ cents upon a pound of wool in the grease, we produced 308,000,000, a total increase in the period of eighteen years of 148,000,000 pounds.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of accuracy I desire to put in the RECORD a statement of the rates of duty under the law of 1867 and the figures showing the wonderful progress during that time:

DUTY ON WOOL UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1867.

CLASS 1.—CLOTHING WOOLS.

Value at place of exportation, excluding charges at such port.
Thirty-two cents or less, 10 cents per pound and 11 per cent ad valorem.
Above 32 cents, 12 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.

CLASS 2.—COMBING WOOLS.

Value 32 cents or less, 10 cents per pound and 11 per cent ad valorem.
Above 32 cents, 12 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.

Production of wool in the United States from 1867 to 1885.

Year.	Pounds.	Increase.	Decrease.
1867.....	160,000,000
1868.....	168,000,000	8,000,000
1869.....	180,000,000	12,000,000
1870.....	162,000,000	18,000,000
1871.....	160,000,000	2,000,000
1872.....	150,000,000	10,000,000
1873.....	138,000,000	8,000,000
1874.....	170,000,000	12,000,000
1875.....	181,000,000	11,000,000
1876.....	192,000,000	11,000,000
1877.....	200,000,000	8,000,000
1878.....	208,250,000	8,250,000
1879.....	211,000,000	2,750,000
1880.....	232,500,000	21,500,000
1881.....	240,000,000	7,500,000
1882.....	273,000,000	32,000,000
1883.....	290,000,000	18,000,000
1884.....	300,000,000	10,000,000
1885.....	308,000,000	8,000,000

Total increase, 148,000,000 pounds.

Increase in number of sheep from 1867 to 1885, 10,074,857.

Increase in the production of wool in eighteen years, 90 per cent.

If the same rate of increase had continued until 1895, we would have produced sufficient wool to have supplied the demand of the American market. There was an increase of 25 per cent in the number of sheep in the United States during the last four years of the operation of the law of 1867.

I desire now to show the House what occurred in the year 1883 to this woolen schedule. The tariff was reduced to 10 cents a pound and the compensatory scheme continued. But in the center of that bill there was a provision inserted known as the "basket clause." That clause enabled the importer to bring broken tops into the United States for 10 cents a pound. I am going to show to the committee just exactly what a broken top is. There is a broken top [indicating] that came into the United States from 1883 to 1889 at a duty of 10 cents. The duty on the raw wool was 10 cents. It takes 3½ pounds of raw wool to produce 1 pound of these broken tops [indicating]. The duty on these broken tops should have been at least 30 cents. But what

occurred? The foreign manufacturers of wool went into the business of manufacturing broken tops.

In 1883 there was about 1,300,000 pounds of broken tops imported in the United States; in 1889 there were 8,000,000 pounds of these broken tops shipped into the United States at 10 cents a pound, when it should have been at least 30 cents. It took the place of or displaced 30,000,000 pounds of the finest Ohio wool.

Now, gentlemen, I want you to remember that fact when we come to the consideration of the proposed schedule in the Payne bill. I want to call your attention to one other item that I think is dangerously close to the unprotected line. Now, in order for you to understand this question as I see it, I desire to give you an exhibit, a concrete illustration, of this specific compensatory duty. There are 3 pounds of wool in the grease [exhibiting], just as it comes from the back of the sheep in the State of Ohio. There it is [exhibiting] in the form of scoured wool. It is reduced to 1 pound, having a shrinkage of 66⅔ per cent.

Now, suppose you only had to pay the same duty on that scoured wool that you had on this wool in the grease [exhibiting]. The scoured wool would escape paying a duty of 22 cents a pound. So, in order to protect wool in the grease, you are compelled to levy a duty on the scoured wool just in proportion to its shrinkage in the process of scouring. It takes three times as much of this wool in the grease as it does of this scoured wool to produce 33 cents of revenue, or it takes 3½ pounds of this wool to produce 1 pound of this [exhibiting tops]; so you must have three and one-fourth times the protection for this [exhibiting tops] in order to protect this [exhibiting wool], and that protection is for the benefit of the producer of wool and not the manufacturer. It goes to the producer of wool, and unless you do have this higher schedule of protection in the ratio of the average shrinkage, you may as well have no protection for wool at all. That is the theory of the specific compensatory duty, and it has remained in the laws of the United States from 1806 down to the present time. [Loud applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to show to the committee the effect of the reduction of the tariff on wool in the grease 2 cents a pound in 1883, and also of this clause, which laid on broken tops a duty of 10 cents a pound.

In 1885 we produced 308,000,000 pounds; in 1889 we produced 265,000,000 pounds. In other words, under the provisions of the law which reduced the tariff below 11 cents the production ran down 43,000,000 pounds in a period of five years. My recollection does not run back to the campaign of 1888 in the State of Ohio, but I am told by General KEIFER and men who figured in the campaign at that time that that loophole in the law of 1883 was the principal argument of that campaign, and the Republican party carried the State in that year more upon that one item than upon any other consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to have printed in the Record the following statement, which shows the decline under reduced duties:

FIRST CLASS—CLOTHING WOOLS.

[Act of March 3, 1883.]

Value at last port or place whence exported, excluding charges at such port:

	Cents.
Not exceeding 30 cents per pound.....	10
Over 30 cents per pound.....	12

Double duty on washed wools.

SECOND CLASS—COMBING WOOLS.

Value at last port whence exported:

	Cents.
Not exceeding 30 cents per pound.....	10
Over 30 cents per pound.....	12

Results of the operation of the law of 1883.

PRODUCTION OF WOOL.

	Pounds.
1885.....	308,000,000
1886.....	302,000,000
1887.....	285,000,000
1888.....	269,000,000
1889.....	265,000,000

Total decrease..... 43,000,000

Above figures indicate a decrease of 17 per cent in five years.

	Number of sheep.
1885.....	50,360,000
1886.....	48,322,000
1887.....	44,759,000
1888.....	44,544,000
1889.....	42,599,000

Total decrease..... 7,761,000

Decrease of 16 per cent in five years.

Under the law of 1883 the courts held that broken tops should be admitted as waste, upon which a duty of 10 cents per pound had been levied. The following figures give the importations of wool under that clause:

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1884.....	1,316,083	\$364,604
1885.....	700,231	287,254
1886.....	3,059,214	1,036,869
1887.....	4,834,636	1,843,823
1888.....	4,483,325	1,719,154
1889.....	8,002,209	3,447,201
1890.....	4,380,327	2,052,078

So the wool and sheep industry were shrinking rapidly in production when that sainted and beloved apostle of protection, William McKinley, appeared upon the scene and inserted in his bill a provision for 11 cents a pound on wool of the first class and 12 cents on wool of the second class.

Now to show the effect of the law of 1890 upon the wool industry of the United States. In the year 1890 we only produced 276,000,000 pounds of wool, and in 1894 we produced 298,000,000 pounds. In a period of four years we had increased our production 22,000,000 pounds. These figures indicate an increase of 12 per cent during four years' operation of the McKinley law.

[Act of October 1, 1890—McKinley law.]

	Cents.
Class 1..... per pound.....	11
Double on washed, treble on scoured wool.	
Class 2..... do.....	12
Treble on scoured wool.	

PRODUCTION FROM 1890 TO 1894.

	Pounds.
1890.....	276,000,000
1891.....	285,000,000
1892.....	294,000,000
1893.....	303,000,000
1894.....	298,000,000

Increase in 1894 over 1890, 22,000,000 pounds.

These figures indicate an increase of 12 per cent under McKinley law.

	Number of sheep.
1890.....	43,431,000
1892.....	44,938,000
1893.....	47,273,000
1894.....	45,048,000
Total.....	180,690,000

Average per year, 45,172,500.

Then we come to the Wilson Act of 1894. The Wilson Act, as you all remember, placed wool on the free list. As a result of that, we came into competition with the wool from South America and the wool from Australia. Wool can be produced in those countries very much cheaper than it can in the United States, or in any other northern climate. The wool industry in Germany from 1875 to 1893 shrunk 45 per cent, because it had no protection against the cheap wools from South America and Australia. The wool industry in the United States can not survive against the wool produced in the tropical and semi-tropical climates of South America, because the cost of labor and the cost of feed in the United States is an element which they do not have to contend with in those southern climates.

What was the effect of the law of 1894? In 1895 we produced 309,000,000 pounds of wool; in 1897, 259,000,000 pounds. So under the operation of the Wilson law, that law that was formed upon the theory of free raw material, there was a decrease in those three years of 50,000,000 pounds.

In 1895 the number of sheep in the United States was 42,000,000; in 1897, 36,000,000. That is the story of the wool industry of the United States as it comes out from under the lack of protection of the Wilson bill.

The following tables will show the great decline under that law and great increase in importation:

Act of August 27, 1894—Wilson bill.

	Pounds.
1895.....	309,000,000
1896.....	272,000,000
1897.....	259,000,000

Decrease in production, 50,000,000 pounds.

	Number of sheep.
1895.....	42,294,000
1896.....	38,298,000
1897.....	36,818,000
Total.....	117,410,000

Average per year, 39,136,000.

Importations under the Wilson bill for the years 1895, 1896, and 1897.

Year.	Duty.	Pounds.	Class.
1895	Free	105,821,000	} Wool in all forms. Wool in the grease.
1896	do.	117,533,000	
1897	do.	176,165,000	
1897	do.	* 48,600,000	
Total		448,119,000	First.
1895	Free	12,400,000	} Second.
1896	do.	10,608,000	
1897	do.	34,897,000	
1897	do.	* 1,466,600	
Total		59,371,000	Do.
1895	Free	136,500,000	} Third.
1896	do.	96,661,000	
1897	do.	* 3,040,000	
1897	do.	107,834,000	
Total		344,035,000	Do.

* Scoured, 50 per cent added for shrinkage.

Total pounds of first-class wool imported for the above years	448,119,000
Total pounds of second-class wool imported for the above years	59,371,000
Total pounds of third-class wool imported for the above years	344,045,000
Total	851,535,000
Average per year	283,845,000

Now I am going to take up the Dingley law, framed in 1897, with a tariff of 11 cents placed on raw wool of the first class and 12 cents on wool of the second class, and your specific compensatory duties carried out to their logical conclusions. In 1898 we produced 266,000,000 pounds in the United States. This year we produced 311,000,000 pounds, an increase in production of 44,000,000 pounds during the operation of the Dingley law. In 1898 there were 37,000,000 sheep in the United States. In 1908 there were 54,000,000, an increase of 17,000,000 in a period of eleven years under the operation of the Dingley law.

Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to another fact. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] declared yesterday upon the floor of this House that there was not a greater friend of the mule in America than he. I want him to understand that the mule, although the emblem of the Democratic party, is no friend of theirs. [Laughter.] In 1898, at the beginning of the Dingley law, the mules in the United States were worth \$92,000,000. This year they are worth \$211,000,000. The mules of the United States, that should have remained steadfast in their party faith, violated every political obligation and increased fourfold in value during a Republican administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. I am asking for information only. The gentleman has spoken of the increase in sheep. Was that confined altogether to the wool-bearing sheep, or does that include the mutton variety also?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have taken these figures from the United States Bureau of Statistics. I think that they include simply the wool-producing sheep of the United States, but of that I am not certain. They may include also the mutton sheep.

Mr. SIMS. I am told that in my own State on account of the high price of mutton the increase in the mutton sheep has been greater than in the wool sheep. In other words, the profit has been greater in mutton than in wool.

Mr. COLE. On the contrary, the mutton-producing sheep of the United States have decreased wonderfully during the last ten years, while the wool-producing sheep, as indicated by the wool output, have increased at a very rapid rate.

Mr. WEISSE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. COLE. Yes.

Mr. WEISSE. According to the Statistical Abstract, 1904, in 1900, a Republican prosperity year, the value of the average horse in the United States was \$45, but in 1893 it was \$62. Was that on account of the Dingley law that they sold for \$17 less in 1900 than they did in 1893?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I deny the statement; and what is more, if the gentleman will give me half an hour to get the correct statistics, I can prove it. The gentleman must understand that the value of horses from 1896 to 1908 has increased just like the value of the mules, fourfold. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WEISSE. If the gentleman will get those statistics and show me that horses were not worth \$17 per head less in

1900 than they were in 1893, according to the Census Department, I will be willing to give him a great deal more time to explain it.

Mr. COLE. I am not asking the gentleman for time. Here are the statistics from the annual report of the Department of Agriculture. Has the gentleman any objection to the authenticity of a report filed by that beloved old friend of the farmers, James Wilson, of Iowa? If not, I will state the figures. The number of horses in the United States in 1900 was 13,537,000. Their value was \$603,000,000. The number of horses in the United States in 1908 was 19,992,000, and their value was \$1,867,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WEISSE. If the gentleman will allow me, that will not give the average price of horses. I want the average price. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have not the time to compute it right now. I will insert in the RECORD the information desired by the gentleman:

Value of horses 1893 (last year of McKinley law)	\$61
Value of horses 1897 (last year of Wilson law)	37
Value of horses 1900	44
Value of horses 1908	93

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman a question about what he said a while ago in reference to the inability to secure correct information as to the cost of production of sheep in this country and in South America and in Australia. The gentleman said it is absolutely impossible to secure that information. Now, would the gentleman be willing to create a tariff commission for the purpose of ascertaining the correct information as to the cost of goods in this country and in other countries?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I am willing that some bureau in the Federal Government shall be set at this particular task of gathering information relative to the cost of production abroad; but if the gentleman had listened to some of these hearings before the committee, where the committee strove in every way possible to extract from the witnesses and from the documentary evidence that they had the cost of production abroad and at home, he would at once realize the great difficulty that confronted that committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have already demonstrated that under this provision in the law of 1867 that has been retained to the present time there has been a great increase in the wool and sheep industry of the United States. Let me make this further statement: If the law of 1867 had remained in full operation without any change until 1895, we would have been producing the entire consumption of the United States, which means about 650,000,000 pounds annually. But on account of the modification of 1883 and the destruction of 1894 it will take now probably a period of fifty years to recuperate the industry in the United States and place it on the footing where it can supply our demand.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to put in the RECORD the following table, which tells the story of progress under the Dingley law.

[Act of July 27, 1897.—Dingley law.]

Duties.		Cents.
Class 1. Unwashed	per pound	11
Washed wool, double duty; scoured, treble duty.		
Class 2. Washed or unwashed	do.	12
Scoured wool, treble duty.		
		Pounds
1898	266,700,000	
1899	272,000,000	
1900	288,600,000	
1901	302,500,000	
1902	316,300,000	
1903	287,000,000	
1904	291,700,000	
1905	295,400,000	
1906	298,900,000	
1907	298,000,000	
1908	311,000,000	
Increase in production, 44,300,000 pounds.		
		Number of sheep.
1898	37,600,000	
1899	39,000,000	
1900	41,800,000	
1901	59,700,000	
1902	62,000,000	
1903	63,900,000	
1904	51,600,000	
1905	45,000,000	
1906	50,000,000	
1907	53,000,000	
Total	* 504,200,000	
1908	54,600,000	
Total	558,800,000	
Average per year, 50,800,000.		
* Increase, 17,000,000.		

Now, gentlemen will say that the protection goes to the producer. I think I can demonstrate that the 11 cents protection on the pound of grease wool goes to the American farmer—the American producer of wool. I want to quote to you the prices in London and the prices in the United States from 1891 up to the present time, showing how the average difference in price was a little over 10 cents a pound, and showing that the 11 cents on that pound of wool in the grease goes to the American producer.

January, 1891, Port Phillip wool which corresponds to but is slightly more valuable than Ohio XX was quoted in the London market at 20 cents under the McKinley law and in New York at 34 cents, a difference of 14 cents in that year. The next year it was quoted in London at 19 cents and in the United States at 30 cents, which is a difference of 11 cents. In 1893 in Europe, 17 cents, in the United States, 24 cents. We had already begun to feel the effects of the Democratic victory of 1892.

Now, watch this remarkable effect on the price of wool. In the United States when the tariff of 1894 went into operation in 1895, Port Phillip was quoted in London at 17 cents, and Ohio XX in the United States at 17 cents—just exactly what it was in London where, two years before under the operation of the McKinley law, with protection of 11 cents, it had been 30 and 34 cents, showing that every penny that is levied upon wool in the grease goes to the American producer.

Watch again. When the Dingley bill went into effect in 1902, Port Phillip was quoted in London at 30 cents and in the United States at 28 cents. In 1905 Port Phillip was quoted in Europe at 25 cents, and in the United States at 36 cents. I shall insert these figures in the Record, showing that within a limit of prices of a cent and a cent and a half during the entire continuation of the McKinley law and the Dingley law the American farmer and producer of wool has received 10 and 11 cents more per pound than the European, South American, and Australian competitor. I also desire to insert a statement of Theodore Justice on this point:

Prices of wool corresponding in quality in England and the United States from 1890 to 1908.

Month and year.	Port Phillip.	Ohio XX.	Difference.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
January, 1891.....	20	34	14
January, 1892.....	19	30	11
January, 1893.....	18	30	12
January, 1894.....	17	24	7
January, 1895.....	17	17	-----
January, 1896.....	17	17	-----
January, 1897.....	19	19	-----
January, 1898.....	21	29	8
January, 1899.....	21	28	7
January, 1901.....	17	28	11
July, 1902.....	20	27	7
July, 1903.....	24	34	10
April, 1904.....	23	34	11
July, 1905.....	25	36	11
July, 1906.....	25	34	9
April, 1907.....	26	35	9
October, 1908.....	23	33	10

Average price of Ohio fine washed wool under McKinley, Wilson, and Dingley laws.

	Cents.
McKinley law.....	31
Wilson law.....	19
Dingley law.....	30

[Justice, Bateman & Co., circular, August 1, 1896.]

THE EFFECTS OF FREE WOOL.

In Table A is a schedule of twelve leading grades of American wool, with the prices in the markets of Philadelphia, Boston, and New York on August 1, 1892, during the second year of the McKinley law, when that law was in full and undisturbed operation. In the next column are the prices in the same markets at this date, the second year of the Wilson-Gorman law. In the third column is the number of cents per pound decline caused by the removal of the McKinley duties. The average decline by the substitution of free trade for McKinley protection on wool has already been 42½ per cent, and prices are still falling. The average price of wool in London, for wool of the same kind and quality, from 1868 to 1894, was 51 per cent lower than in the protected markets of the United States during that time. This difference has now been overcome by the domestic decline and the foreign advance. The removal of protection, which caused American prices to fall, stimulated the London wool market, and the latter has been advancing during the period that American markets have been declining. The London prices for foreign wool of the same kind and quality as the domestic are shown in Table B. If it was not the removal of the McKinley duties which caused this decline in American wools when the markets of the world were advancing, what was it?

TABLE A.—American wool, Philadelphia and Boston prices.

	Price Aug. 1, 1892, second year of McKinley law.	Price Aug. 1, 1896, second year of Wilson-Gorman law.	Amount per pound lower.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
XX Ohio washed.....	29	17	12
Ohio medium washed.....	33	19½	13½
Ohio coarse washed (¾ blood).....	32½	18½	14
Ohio fine unwashed.....	20½	12	8½
Indiana and Missouri fine unwashed.....	19½	11	8½
Indiana and Missouri medium unwashed (¾ blood).....	25½	14½	10½
Indiana and Missouri coarse (¾ blood) unwashed.....	24½	15	9½
Oregon and Colorado fine, shrink 70 per cent.....	17	8	9
XX Ohio scoured.....	63	35	30
Ohio medium scoured.....	55	33	22
Ohio ¾ blood scoured.....	43	25	18
Oregon and Colorado fine scoured.....	57	30	27

Average American decline in two years, 42½ per cent.

TABLE B.—Foreign wool, London prices.

	Price Aug. 1, 1892, in London.	Price Aug. 1, 1896, in London.	Higher.
	Pence.	Pence.	Pence.
Port Phillip greasy (similar to XX Ohio).....	11	11	-----
New Zealand and crossbred greasy (similar to Ohio medium).....	9½	10	½
English Shropshire hoggets (similar to Ohio ¾ blood).....	10½	10½	-----
Cape grease (similar to territorial fine).....	6	7	1
Port Phillip scoured.....	22	22	-----
New Zealand crossbred scoured.....	16	17½	1½
English Shropshire hogs.....	13½	14	½
Fine Cape scoured.....	15	17½	2½

Average London advance in two years, 9 per cent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have demonstrated three propositions beyond a possible doubt. First, that the ad valorem duty levied for the protection of American woolen manufacturers is not exorbitant, inasmuch as it is only 3 per cent higher than that levied by the Wilson bill. Second, I think I have demonstrated the value of the specific compensatory duty, and that that duty does not go to the American manufacturer, but does go to the American producer; and when they say that we are placing a protection of 110 to 120 per cent upon the American manufacturers, they falsify the record and convict themselves of ignorance of the operation of the specific compensatory duty. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I notice that the gentleman omitted the prices for 1906, 1907, and 1908. I suggest that the gentleman give those figures.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, with a relish that is excusable I give the figures. In 1905 Port Phillip was 25 cents and Ohio XX 34 cents. In 1906 Port Phillip was 25 cents and Ohio XX 34 cents. In 1907 Port Phillip was 26 cents and Ohio XX 35 cents. Mr. Chairman, there is a deviation of 1 cent in some of these years, but I think that should be explained on the ground that there was quite a general depression of prices in the United States during the last few years.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What was it for 1908?

Mr. COLE. October, 1908; that is the latest report—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, no; there are several reports later than that.

Mr. COLE (continuing). To which I have had access; and inasmuch as I have scattered this over a period of twenty years, the unvarying truth remains, and it occurs to me that you can accept as authority the month of October, 1908. That month Port Phillip was 23 cents, Ohio XX 33 cents, showing that you got your protection and the American producer gets it and not the American manufacturer.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. How does the gentleman account for the tremendous fall in the price of American wool, amounting to something like 10 cents a pound, while this protective tariff that has been the cause of all the prosperity to the wool-growers is still in force?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have given the gentleman the quotations of the markets of the United States from 1890 up until the present time. If the gentleman will look into those prices and study the subject as he should, he will discover there is no such discrepancy.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], in commenting on the amount of the revenue taken in on the sugar schedule, said that it was \$65,000,000, but that it cost about \$110,000,000. I wanted to ask the gentleman his method of computation, but he would not answer a question. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio now if he can tell us what the revenue received on this woolen schedule has cost the country? Give us the method of calculation.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have not computed what it cost the consumer. I represent an agricultural district in the State of Ohio. I want those farmers out there to get that 11 cents extra upon their wool, and that is what they have been getting during the last ten years. Now, let me tell you something further. The gentleman is in favor of a tariff for revenue only. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak now just a minute on this schedule from the standpoint of the revenue producer. This schedule during the operation of the Dingley law has produced \$292,000,000 of revenue for the United States Treasury, one of the best in the entire bill. If the gentleman is in favor of even a tariff for revenue only, it occurs to me that he ought to stand by Schedule K, and at the same time grant proper protection to the producer of wool in the United States.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. It was with that view that I wished to know the gentleman's idea of how much it cost, because if it cost \$50 to get one in the Treasury, I am not in favor of it.

Mr. COLE. I have not entered into that computation. The gentleman is trying, as all apostles of free trade do, to discriminate between the consumer and the producers of the United States.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. But I am not a free trader.

Mr. COLE. Then, I make my humble apologies to the gentleman from Texas, and we welcome him into our camp. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I do not believe in taking money out of any man's pocket without his consent, except by due process of law.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, this bill is going to become a law, I think, within the next six weeks; and when it does, it will redound to the undying credit of the Republican party and the utter demoralization of the Democratic party, which has been constantly fighting it.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further. Mr. Chairman, as I said, the gentleman is trying to distinguish between the consumer and the producer. My judgment is that the consuming power of the Nation is dependent upon its producing power. A nation that does not produce, a man that does not produce, can not consume. There are between seven and eight million workmen in the United States and perhaps eight or ten million farmers. There are 30,000,000 American people to-day engaged in what is commonly known as "productive" enterprises.

Of course the clerk working on a salary in the office and Congressmen, perhaps, are consumers, might be listed among the consumers, and not producers, but let me tell you that the salary that the clerk gets in the office is measured and dependent upon the wages the workman gets in the factory. When the consumers, so-called, of the United States deny a proper reward to the producer, they themselves will drag down their own interests. We all stand on a common level, and when you deny to the producer a proper compensation you are going to regulate the scale of salaries for the clerk and those commonly called "consumers" accordingly. I think that doctrine that has been preached in this country, that one class can stand alone, is wrong. We must all stand together or fall together, and the basis of our industrial structure, of our commercial and social life, is the wages paid to the American producer. If you destroy the producer you can not assist the consumer.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. Yes.

Mr. GILLESPIE. I admire the zeal, Mr. Chairman, with which the gentleman from Ohio stands by the sheep grower of his district and says that he shall get that 11 cents a pound on wool by legislation. Can the gentleman help me to see that my cotton growers get 5 cents a pound on their cotton by legislation?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, if I settle this wool schedule I think the gentleman from Texas ought to settle the cotton proposition. [Laughter.] He is here in the capacity of a Representative, rated among the great statesmen of the Nation, and recognized as a man of great constructive skill, and why he

can not settle a minor proposition such as that is beyond all comprehension. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. GILLESPIE. Would the gentleman from Ohio join me in voting a bounty of 5 cents per pound to the cotton growers of Texas if I were to ask it?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I have not studied the effect of that upon the cotton industry or upon the general industries of the United States. When I have given to that subject the consideration I have given to the wool and woolen schedules, I will be glad to give the gentleman the benefit of my views.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Texas vote for a 5 cents a pound bounty upon cotton?

Mr. GILLESPIE. I am not the constructive genius the gentleman from Ohio is. He is such a constructive genius as to be able to give the producer of wool 11 cents a pound. Now, can he not be generous enough to give the cotton growers of Texas the benefit of that wonderful genius and by legislation put money into their pockets?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no disposition to encroach upon the rights of the South. "O, heroic South, we rejoice in your renewed prosperity this day. We hail with rapture the dawn of thy nobler destiny. Mantled with freedom's majesty, a pillar thou shalt stand immutable in the magnificent temple of American constitutional liberty. Fight against you? No; never. Your interests are as sacred to me as the interests of the North." [Loud applause.]

Mr. GILLESPIE. I want to state to the gentleman from Ohio that I believe that the interests of the people of the South would be just as safe in his hands as if he were of the South if the interests of his own people did not lead him to overlook the interests of my people, but as an honest American citizen demanding fair play, how can the gentleman stand here and demand that the consumers of woolen fabrics of the South raising cotton—and I want to tell the gentleman from Ohio that there are no short days of labor for those people; I sprang from them; the men, women, and children are in the fields from the dawn until the dark—shall pay a tax of 100 per cent on the woolsens they consume in order that his woolgrowers may receive 11 cents a pound more for their wool than the market justifies?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, much as I am charmed with the delicious English of the gentleman from Texas, I must decline to yield further. I have one further proposition to which I wish to call attention, and I have but a very short time. Under the present law we have placed a duty of 11 cents on this wool in the grease, 33 cents on the scoured wool. That is good so far, but there is a by-product of this process of manufacture that I feel is going very seriously to affect the wool industry of the United States, this loophole in the law of 1883. Now, let me explain. There is an article known as "tops" [exhibiting]. That is the very finest quality of wool. It is 24 karats fine. That item is admitted in the present schedule under a duty of 39 cents, three times the amount of wool in the grease from which it is made, and 6 cents additional. Here is an item of wool called "broken tops," and this slubbing waste is just as valuable when you get it in that condition as tops. The duty on that slubbing waste is 20 cents. There is a sample of tops made out of slubbing waste, and there is the regular article. [Exhibiting same.] No man can distinguish them. That comes in at 39 cents, and this comes in at 20, and with 1 cent additional you can put them in the same condition. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the great objection that I have to Schedule K as it stands in the proposed bill at the present time.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia. Will the gentleman from Ohio permit me to inquire under what name what he calls "broken tops" is dealt with in this schedule?

Mr. COLE. Slubbing waste.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia. Will the gentleman tell me also whether that article is included in paragraph 368—in the same paragraph and at the same rate as the product or by-product designated as "ring waste"? Can the gentleman tell me whether "ring waste" is of the same nature as the article of which the gentleman has been speaking?

Mr. COLE. It is of the same nature, but it has not quite the same value. It has to be "garnetted," in the language of the trade, before it gets into this condition, that of tops, and costs perhaps 3 or 4 cents.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia. Will the gentleman indulge me further until I read from a letter received to-day from the president of the Tri-State Wool Growers' Association, an association of woolgrowers in the States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio?

He says:

The part we fear most is the scoured wool admitted under paragraph 368 as ring waste, at 20 cents. It should have been raised to 33 cents per pound instead of being reduced. This wool called "waste" is al-

most ready to weave, being scoured clean and run on reels just before being made into yarn, and will be a competitor against which we can not compete in cost of land, labor, or any other of the many items making up our cost.

Mr. COLE. There is only one safe method of levying a duty on wool, and that is in accordance with shrinkage in the process of refining. I desire to insert in the RECORD a statement of a prominent woolen manufacturer showing the amount of this shrinkage on 1,000 pounds of wool. This statement was made to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and received the sanction of every manufacturer who appeared before the committee.

Shrinkages.		Pounds.
Wool to wash.....	1,000	
Wool loss in wash (65 per cent).....	650	
Wool to cards.....	350	
Wool loss in cards (1.35 per cent).....	47	
Off comb waste.....	345½	
Wool to combs.....	344	
Nolls (17 per cent).....	58½	
Tops to yarn (83 per cent).....	285½	
Waste.....	14½	
Loss.....	14½	
Amount of yarn.....	257	

This statement demonstrates the necessity of the graduated scale. One thousand pounds of wool shrinks to 285½ pounds when reduced to tops and 257 pounds when reduced to yarn. This fact has been recognized for forty years, and a great industry is based upon it.

The same principle applies with almost equal force in levying the duty upon the by-product of wool. If the duty on the by-product is fixed greatly below the rate which its corresponding commercial value would demand, the main product is converted into by-product and admitted to this country in competition with our own wool at the reduced rate. I desire to insert in the RECORD a comparison of commercial value of all the by-products with scoured wool of the first class, showing the rate of duty demanded to prevent dangerous competition.

Comparison of the commercial value of scoured wool with the by-products upon a basis of 33 cents duty on scoured wool and fixing duty on by-products accordingly.

Kind.	Comparative value.	Dingley.	Payne.	Relative duty.
		Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
Scoured wool.....	100	33	33	33
Top waste.....	105	30	25	34
Roving waste.....	100	30	25	33
Slubbing waste.....	105	30	20	34
Ring waste.....	100	30	20	33
Garnetted waste.....	100	30	20	33
Shoddy.....	90	25	20	25
Nolls.....	60	20	18	20
Wool extract.....	60	20	18	20
Yarn waste.....	60	20	18	20
Thread.....	60	20	18	20
Woolen rags.....	30	10	6	10
Mungo.....	20	10	6	6
Flocks.....	20	10	6	6

Tops are admitted under the provisions of section 371, if made of first-class wool, at 39 cents; if made of second-class wool, at 42 cents. Slubbing waste, under the provisions of section 368, is admitted under a duty of 20 cents per pound. It only costs 1 cent to transform slubbing waste into tops.

Mr. Chairman, my time has about expired. I do not care to encroach further upon the time of the committee or their patience; but I wish to say one thing in conclusion.

Yesterday in the discussion of this measure the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] took occasion to criticize in a very caustic manner one of the witnesses who appeared before the committee. I am not here in defense of that gentleman. If he did wrong, let it be published to the world; but what I do say is this: That we can not afford to build up a great schedule in this bill upon a prejudice. The wool industry of the United States is not circumscribed by one man. There are thousands of people engaged in this business. In fact, I might say that there are millions who depend for their livelihood and their comfort upon this great industry. We can not afford to destroy an industry, or, at least, imperil millions of wealth and impoverish thousands of people, in order to penalize some man who has not proven worthy of his trust. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I crave indulgence of the House while I submit some very brief observations upon the pending measure, and what I lack, Mr. Chairman, in a comprehensive knowledge of the details of the tariff bill I hope to make up by the candor and sincerity with which I express myself. I shall not trespass upon the time of the House by entering into a lengthy academic discussion of the tariff question. Suffice it to say that the collection of revenues for the maintenance of government by means of duties on imports is almost as ancient as government itself. It is an indirect tax upon the consumer; and while it is an unequal tax, in that it taxes the people in proportion to what they eat, drink, wear, and use instead of what they own, yet the experience of men and governments has demonstrated that the people will submit to this form of taxation with less complaining than any other mode ever devised by the ingenuity of man.

There are two theories in this country with regard to this form of indirect taxation. The Republican party insists upon using the taxing power of the Government for the purpose of protection. They look upon the tax as a blessing, because it protects the domestic manufacturer against foreign competition and enables him to get a higher price for his goods.

The Democratic party holds to the opposite view. We regard taxation in every form as a burden upon the people, and the greater the tax the greater the burden. We regard this particular form of taxation as especially burdensome to the people, because under Republican high-tariff exactions five dollars out of every six taken from the pockets of the people goes into the coffers of the protected manufacturers, while only one dollar out of every six goes into the Federal Treasury for the support of the Government. Under the Republican doctrine the greater the tax the greater the blessing, while under the Democratic theory, the greater the tax the heavier the burden to those who must pay and bear it. For myself, Mr. Chairman, I believe that every tax, no matter how you conceal and disguise it, is a burden to those who pay the tax. And I believe, sir, that the exercise of the taxing power of the Government at the expense of the whole people for the benefit of a part of the people is robbery under the form of law. It is an axiomatic truth that protection is absolutely worthless until it reaches the point where it increases the price to the consumer, that silent, absent man, who pays the burden with stolid indifference, whose interests are uncared for by a lobby at the Capitol, and whose troubles, cares, and burdens seem to find no place in the solicitous philanthropy of Republican economy. Under the Republican theory that taxation is a blessing and not a burden a system of unparalleled extravagance has grown up in the expenditures of this Government.

Extravagance is the natural sequence of such a doctrine. What man among you can consistently demand an economic administration of the affairs of government if you believe that to tax is to bless the people? When you thus pervert and debase the whole theory of taxation, it follows as naturally and as surely as night follows day that the system of expenditure will likewise become perverted and debauched. An economic administration of the Government would be fatal to the whole scheme of protection, because it would destroy the excuse for levying the tax, and the tax must be levied in order to afford the protection. Under that fallacious doctrine of the Republican party, abominable alike to common sense and economic wisdom, the expenditures of this Government have grown until they exceed the expenditures of every other government in the world. From simplicity and economy in the administration of the Government we have assumed that degree of complexity and extravagance which savors more of monarchy than democracy, and leaves us in those respects a Republic in little else than name. The appropriations for the last fiscal year were more than a billion dollars, with every selfish interest in the Government knocking clamorously at the door of the Treasury. Of this stupendous sum more than 50 per cent was expended on account of wars of the past or preparations for wars in the future, while less than 1 per cent was spent in the encouragement of the great agricultural interests of this country. You are taking daily toll from those who toil in field and factory, in mill and mine, in order that you may build up a great army and navy.

Mr. Chairman, the pending measure is just what the people of the United States had a right to expect at the hands of the Republican party. Their platform declared that the—

True principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

The distinguished author of the pending bill [Mr. PAYNE] is not satisfied with having the Government guarantee profits to

American industries. He goes the platform one better and says that—

Our minimum tariff is a protective tariff built on the lines of our party platform, and sometimes a little more than the party platform, because it is impossible to hold the scales evenly, even with all the information available to your committee on all these schedules.

Mr. Chairman, if the English language is comprehensible to the average mind, the Republican party stands committed to a tariff tax which will amount to practical prohibition of imports where such imports would come into competition with any American manufacturer who is fortunate enough to find cover beneath the sheltering wings of the Republican party. Under the terms of this platform declaration two things must happen before the consumer can purchase in a competitive market: First, a tariff tax must be levied against articles produced or manufactured abroad sufficiently high to equalize the difference in the cost of production or manufacture at home and abroad. Second, after taxing the imported goods high enough to thus equalize that difference and start the articles of merchandise out in an equal race for the markets of the world, an additional tax must be levied against the imported article sufficient to guarantee to the domestic producer a reasonable profit. So that, Mr. Chairman, while the imported article is being sold in the market at a price that equals the cost of production, the domestic article yields its vendor a reasonable profit. Under this arrangement, if the imported goods sell in our market at a reasonable profit, the domestic manufacture will sell at two reasonable profits. The effect of all this is that, so long as the domestic manufacturer contents himself with a reasonable profit, the importer is driven from the markets; and when the importer does come into our markets and receives a reasonable profit on his goods, it is the inexorable law of this doctrine that the domestic manufacturer shall receive a double profit. And on top of all this the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] would resolve every doubt against the consumer.

I should be glad, Mr. Chairman, to direct the attention of the House to certain paragraphs in the bill in which I feel an especial interest.

We do not expect you to frame a tariff bill that will protect the cotton raisers of the South. They do not demand that you lay a tribute upon their brethren in toil for their especial benefit. The cotton growers of the South, magnificent in their manhood and energy and possessed of the most fertile soil of the earth, neither supplicate nor expect the fostering hand of the Federal Government. We are even willing to make up some of the defalcations of our brethren who inhabit the barren soils of other sections; but we implore you, in the name of justice, not to pile it on too thick. [Laughter and applause.]

I want to call your attention to paragraph 460 of the Dingley bill, supplanted by paragraph 468 of the Payne bill, which levies an ad valorem tax of 20 per cent on the users of agricultural implements. Mr. Chairman, last year there were imported into the United States only \$23,643.70 worth of agricultural implements, which yielded to the Federal Government the pitiful sum of \$4,728.74. During the same period we sent abroad to the markets of the world \$26,936,456 worth of these same articles. Thus your protective tariff, amounting to practical prohibition, while bringing a paltry few thousand into the Treasury, laid the farmers of this country under tribute to the International Harvester trust, which concern exported for last year more than \$25,000,000 worth of these agricultural implements. By your unjust tax you gave no revenue to the Government, but you forbade the farmers of the country to buy their implements where they could get them cheapest, and thus encouraged the organization of this colossal combine to prey upon those who use the plow, the hoe, the rake, the mower, the reaper, and other tools and implements by means of which the sturdy sons of toil wring from the earth the annual harvest of the Nation. And so, while the farmers of my district are willing to pay a reasonable tax and bear their part of the public burdens, we do insist, with all vehemence of which we are capable, that when you tax us you place the money into the hands of the Public Treasury, and not into the pockets of the International Harvester trust. [Applause.]

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, these prohibitory duties of which we complain are working, as I perceive, havoc with the commerce of this country. One of the representatives of the harvester trust who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee testified as follows:

Our manufacturers would prefer to make everything that they sell abroad in this country, but owing to the extensive duty and threatened discriminations in the tariffs of some nations against the products of this country there have been built factories in Canada and Sweden, and there will soon be built similar plants in Germany and France if they continue to sell goods in those markets unless a favorable treaty can be ratified.

From the following dispatch, which appeared in the Washington Post of March 22, it appears that the harvester trust is rapidly investing the millions wrung from the farmers of America in foreign lands:

HARVESTER PLANTS ABROAD—TRUST WILL MANUFACTURE ITS MACHINES IN FRANCE AND GERMANY.

[Special to the Washington Post.]

CHICAGO, March 22, 1909.

The International Harvester Company proposes to invest \$30,000,000 in the establishment of two manufacturing plants in Europe, one in France and one in Germany. Sites have been already selected and construction work started. The plant in France is to be at Lille, in the Province of Croix, near the Belgian border, while the German plant will be at Dusseldorf.

C. S. Funk, general manager of the company, is quoted as saying that all the raw materials needed for the manufacture of various harvesting machines which the company makes are obtainable in Europe, and after the new plants are in working order shipments of the manufactured products from this country to ports in Europe will cease.

High tariffs imposed by a majority of foreign countries on manufactured products are said to be responsible to a large extent for the decision to build plants abroad.

Other nations possess intelligence as well as we. If we will not admit their products to our markets upon reasonable terms, they reply, in sheer self-defense, that our products must keep out of their markets. Thus your short-sighted system of restriction, while bringing only \$4,728 in revenues to the Government, has built up a trust at the expense of the great agricultural body of our people, which trust calmly walks away with the booty to build factories in other lands. So I say to you, on behalf of those who till the soil and feed the Nation, if you must rob us by exacting tribute from every stroke of our hands, let the tribute find its way into the empty Treasury of the Nation and not into the bulging coffers of the trusts. [Laughter and applause.]

The change proposed by the Payne bill for this schedule affords no practical relief to agriculture. It reduces the tax only 5 per cent, coupled with pretended free trade, which is dependent upon the laws of other nations for effect.

It would be impossible for me to take this bill up paragraph by paragraph. I but pick out prominent ones to illustrate the complexion of the whole. As you laid tribute upon the farmer that the proceeds might go to the harvester trust, so you laid tribute upon the millions who use kerosene oil in order that you might add to the colossal wealth of Standard Oil. Mr. Chairman, I represent a district which produces more crude oil than any congressional district in the United States, but I believe those of my constituents who are producers of oil will be satisfied with an honest tariff, one which equalizes the burdens of taxation among all the people of all the sections. I believe the consumers of oil in my district are willing to pay a reasonable tax upon the oil they consume, provided the tax goes to the Government and not to the oil trust. Under our present prohibitive tariff tax on the importation of petroleum and its products, not one dollar's worth came to this country last year, and hence not a penny went into the Federal Treasury. The consumers of oil paid the tax, however, in the shape of tribute to the greatest monopoly in the world. This "infant industry," which sent abroad last year \$78,000,000 worth of its products, demands a protective tax so high that it amounts to absolute prohibition. The countervailing duty is not only a sham and a fraud, but a brutal perversion of the taxing power of the Government. By its terms you provide that the extent of the taxes to be paid by our people shall be determined by the extent of taxes levied upon the people of other countries. Thus, as to the countervailing duty on petroleum and its products, you say to the people: We will tax you just as high as Russia taxes her subjects, and we will give you no relief until the Czar gives relief to his subjects.

The distinctive difference in the operation of this self-adjusted prohibitory tax in Russia and the United States is that in that oppressed land the Czar robs his subjects and appropriates the money to his own use and benefit, while under the present law, and the one proposed, we rob our people for the sole and exclusive benefit of the Standard Oil Company. Since you forbid us by this law to buy oil in foreign lands and since the Standard Oil is a self-confessed monopolist of the domestic market, you leave us to the tender mercies of this commercial anaconda, which fixes the price we pay without regard to the laws of trade or humanity and in defiance of the laws of both God and man.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a country where we produce lumber in large quantities, the tariff on which the pending bill scales down 50 per cent. In the district I have the honor to represent is a flourishing young industry of rice growing, the tariff upon which, under the terms of the present bill, endangers alike the revenues of the Government and the rice farmer

by opening up a sort of smugglers' free trade through the Philippine Islands with India and Asia. But notwithstanding these worthy interests in my district, and no matter what their views might be, I stand for an honest revision of the tariff in the interests of the American people. I detest that spirit of blind sectional selfishness which demands free trade for all that it buys and high tariff for all that it sells. The trouble with our Republican brethren is that they imagine reform means reforming the other fellow. [Applause.] I have heard a good deal of late, Mr. Chairman, about President Taft's desire to win the South. I would say to the President that it can not be done by means of the Payne tariff bill, a measure which displays more sectional unfairness against the South and the West than any other tariff bill ever presented to Congress.

The farmers of my district pay tribute to the favored pets of Republican tariff taxation in every furrow they plow and in every acre they till. You tax them upon the ax and saw with which they fell the forest and prepare the land for cultivation; you tax the plow and hoe with which he cultivates the soil; you tax the harness upon his mule and the hat upon his head. Nothing escapes the watchful eye of the Republican tax-gatherer—his clothes, his shoes, his tools—his all. When his crop is made, if it be cotton, you tax the very sack in which he picks it, the wagon in which he hauls it, the gin in which he separates it, and the bagging and ties with which he wraps it. "It enhances the price of almost everything—of the salt that seasons the poor man's dish, the iron that points his plow, the woolen that covers his body, the glass that lights his dwelling, the beverage that slakes his thirst—it burdens almost all the comforts and enjoyments of his life in eating, in drinking, in his raiment, in walking, in riding, in reading, and in sleeping, and in articulo mortis it clings to the coffin that receives his mortal remains, and the spade that prepares his last home, where he may sleep with his fathers and mingle with mother earth." Of the tax thus wrung from his labor at every turn you deliver \$5 out of \$6 to the pets of your system and only \$1 to the Government of the United States. Not satisfied with the neglect and injustice you have visited upon these southern farmers, you deliberately place their chief product—cotton—on the free list and invite them to hold their own as best they may in the open sea of commercial struggle.

Last year there was imported into the United States more than \$19,000,000 worth of cotton, upon which the tariff law neither collected revenue for the support of the Government nor the protection of those who produced the domestic cotton. It is idle to say in explanation that we are large exporters of cotton, and that we are amply able to take care of ourselves in the cotton markets of the world, for the same is true of wheat, and yet you place a tax of 25 cents a bushel on wheat. Not satisfied with thus discriminating against the southern farmer you found out that since the enactment of the Dingley law our farmers are getting a good price for their cotton seed, from which cotton-seed oil is taken, and you proceed to clap cotton-seed oil on the free list.

If the Republican party ever hopes to win the South or hold the West let them make haste to declare for the white man's dominion of this Government and the integrity of the Caucasian race. Let them repeal their odious sectional tariff laws, and instead let them tax every section and every product with fairness, justice, and impartiality.

Universal robbery amounts to no robbery at all, because the robbed becomes the robber and the robber gets robbed in his turn. You stand for a protective tariff because it takes from one man and gives to another man. If it took from all men to give to all men you would cast it aside as a useless means of oppression because it would not serve your selfish purpose.

Mr. Chairman, a kind providence has wonderfully blessed the Southern States. In spite of the devastating effects of war and disaster, together with the evil effects of discriminatory laws of taxation, she has risen like a giant from the couch of her recent infirmities. She possesses within her borders more wealth and population than were possessed by the entire Union at the beginning of the civil war. Her vast resources are practically untouched and her energy and determination know no bounds. So that no matter how unfair your taxes may be we still have our sunny skies and fertile soil, our noble men and women—the future is ours. With devotion to the Union and its every part we bide the day of our triumph with patriotic resignation. [Applause.]

Mr. KNAPP. Mr. Chairman, the tariff involves the question of the industrial policy of the Nation, both as it provides for raising the revenue necessary for the support of the Government, and also as it affects our diversified industries. For the support of the Government large revenues are necessary, no matter what party may be in power or what tariff policy may be

established. These revenues are used in defraying the expenses of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government; also in the payment of pensions, in maintaining the army and navy, in improving rivers and harbors, in continuing and enlarging our mail facilities, rural free delivery, and so forth. For the support of the General Government and maintaining these expenses there is no direct taxation, unless the internal-revenue taxes may be so considered. The revenues necessary for these purposes are largely raised from two sources—duties levied on imports and internal revenue.

But, beyond the raising of revenue for the support of the Government, the tariff involves the protection to our own industries and labor, and upon this question, the real industrial policy of the Nation, the two parties take issue. All are agreed that tariff duties should be levied for the necessary revenues for the support of the Government, but beyond that point the two parties differ, and for half a century have joined issue. For fifty years the Democratic party, both by declaration of principle in party platform and record, has stood for a tariff for revenue only. During a like period of time the Republican party has maintained, with unflinching loyalty, the principle of a tariff not only for revenue, but also for the protection of home industries and labor. The difference between these two policies, like the resultant effects of the same, are clear, distinct, and well defined.

These two policies have been tested in our national life and experience. The resultant effect of each have been written into the history of this Republic. Upon the certainty of the past we can judge of the probability of the future. By the experience of the years which have gone, we should and may correctly build for those which are to come.

In 1892 the Democratic party was restored to power in the legislative and executive branches of the National Government. It was committed to a revision of the tariff upon the basic principle of tariff for revenue only. Straightway the party proceeded to put into effect this policy. The tariff law bearing the name of that patriot and statesman whose memory will ever be safe in the keeping of his grateful countrymen, William McKinley, was repealed, and there was substituted therefor what was known as the "Wilson tariff bill." That law was intended to be based upon the principle of a tariff for revenue only, and well illustrated the effect of that principle in our industrial experience. It is not necessary to here, in any detail, recall the resultant effects of that law. They are still fresh in the minds of the people. Three long years of industrial depression followed, so appalling in their ruinous results upon our diversified industries that they should serve as a warning for the future against a tariff policy based solely upon the necessary revenues for the support of the Government.

TARIFF REVISIONS.

But further, and as more fully illustrating the effect of these two policies, let us recall a little of tariff history as it has affected the Nation's industrial progress.

Our tariff laws have been revised, in whole or in important part, more than a score of times, and it is a striking fact that the revisions which have given adequate protection to our industries have been beneficial, while, on the other hand, those which have had for their purpose tariff for revenue only have been disastrous.

I will discuss what may properly be termed two epochs in our tariff history—the epoch when the basic principle of our tariff laws was free trade or for revenue only and the epoch when the basic principle was both for revenue and protection. The year 1860 divided these epochs. The period prior to that, in the main, illustrates the effects of the former policy, while the period from 1860 to the present well illustrates the effects of the latter policy. The second measure introduced into the American Congress was a revenue measure. That was the tariff act of 1789, the first in our history. That act had for its purpose both the raising of revenue for the support of the Government and protection to our then infant industries. So it was protective in its features and was beneficial to the industries of the country in the beginning of their development. That law, with slight amendments, continued in force until 1812, when the tariff was revised as a war measure and the duties nearly doubled. Four years later this act was displaced with the tariff of 1816, which greatly reduced the duties and utterly failed as a measure for adequate protection. Succeeding this was the tariff of 1824–1828, which was intended to be more protective and which was of short duration and effect. Then came the tariff of 1832–3, when low duties were again adopted. The injurious result of this law influenced the enactment of the tariff of 1842, intended to be more protective, but which was continued only four years. Then, in 1846, the so-called "Walker tariff" was

placed on the statute books. This was the nearest approach to free trade which we had experienced, and for fourteen years our country underwent severe industrial changes and we had to submit to all but ruinous conditions.

So, that the history of our tariff legislation demonstrates that while the first tariff law enacted was protective in its features, and while the laws of 1816, 1824-1828, and 1842 were also intended to be so protective, still during by far the larger part of the period from 1789 to 1861 our tariff laws were based on the policy of tariff for revenue with, in one instance, an approach to free trade. What were the resultant effects of this?

During the period prior to 1860 the balance of trade against the United States and in favor of foreign nations aggregated \$1,270,000,000. We had 140,000 manufacturing establishments, which employed 1,311,000 employees. At the end of the period, or in 1860, the annual value of the manufactured products of the United States amounted in the aggregate to, in round numbers, \$1,885,000,000. The wages paid to labor in the manufacturing industries aggregated \$378,878,000. The deposits in savings banks aggregated \$149,277,000. The annual value of our imports aggregated, in 1860, \$353,616,000. The annual value of the exports was \$333,576,000. The monetary circulation of the country aggregated \$435,407,000. The railway mileage of the country was 30,626. The wealth of the United States aggregated \$16,159,616,000. We were paying interest on our bonded indebtedness at from 4 to 12 per cent per annum. Our government bonds were a lug in the markets of the world at 13 cents discount on the dollar. Our Treasury was virtually bankrupt.

At the end of this period, and in 1861, the Republican party came into power in the executive and legislative branches of the Government. Then new tariff laws were enacted and new industrial policies instituted, based upon the principle of revenue for the support of the Government, and also protection to American industries and labor. From that time until the present, with the exception of about three years, during which the so-called "Wilson tariff bill" was in effect, these policies have been continued.

Under these protective policies we paid on the debt created by the civil war, in addition to the interest, in round numbers, \$2,200,000,000. We have fought a foreign war and have paid the expenses of that war, aggregating \$500,000,000. The number of manufacturing establishments has increased from 140,000 to 515,000, and the number of men employed has increased from 1,311,000 to about 6,000,000. The annual value of our manufactured products has increased from \$1,885,000,000 to nearly \$15,000,000,000. The wages paid to labor have increased from \$378,000,000 to about \$2,611,000,000. The deposits in savings banks have increased from \$149,000,000 to \$3,479,000,000. The annual value of imports has increased from \$353,000,000 to \$1,194,000,000. The annual value of exports has increased from \$333,576,000 to \$1,860,000,000. The monetary circulation of the country has increased from \$435,000,000 to \$3,038,000,000. The railway mileage of the country has increased from 30,000 miles to 228,000 miles. The wealth of the United States has increased from \$16,000,000,000 to \$107,000,000,000. Our bonded indebtedness, in the main, bears interest at but 2 and 2½ per cent per annum, and our government securities are caught up at a premium in all the markets of the world.

DINGLEY TARIFF LAW.

As still further emphasizing the fact that under the policies of a protective tariff the country has prospered, we may cite our industrial progress during the period since the present tariff law, known as "the Dingley law," has been on the statute books. This law has now been in force nearly twelve years. Twelve years is not a long period in a nation's history, but the recent twelve years have been eventful.

During this period greater industrial progress has come to the Nation than during all the preceding period since that struggle which made one the American Union. During that period the total capital invested in our diversified industries has about doubled; the total wages paid laborers and the total value of the products of our industries have nearly doubled. This progress has not come exclusively to any one class of our citizens; it has come to all; to the farmer, the manufacturer, the laboring man, the business man, in whatever avenue of our diversified industries they may walk.

The deposits in our savings banks have increased from \$1,935,000,000 in 1896 to \$3,479,000,000 in 1908. The total money in circulation in the country has increased from \$1,506,000,000 to \$3,038,000,000. The total annual value of the manufacturing products has increased until they reach, in round figures, nearly \$15,000,000,000. The total value of the agricultural products has increased until they aggregate for the past

year, in round numbers, nearly \$8,000,000,000, the largest sum ever realized to agriculture in any one year in any one nation. The total value of our industrial trade and commerce has advanced until it has reached the unrivaled aggregate of nearly \$26,000,000,000.

Turning to our foreign trade and commerce, we find the resultant effects during this period equally as striking. During the same period our exports have more than doubled, and our imports nearly doubled. Our exports are increased from \$882,000,000 in 1896 to \$1,860,000,000 in 1908, making us, as an exporting nation, the rival of Great Britain, which has heretofore been called the "workshop of the world."

The imports for 1896 were \$779,000,000 and for 1908 they increased to \$1,194,000,000. During this period our exports have reached such a volume as to give us a balance of trade averaging nearly \$400,000,000 per year. Excess of exports during the past twelve years over imports has amounted to about \$6,000,000,000, and the balance of trade during the past six years in favor of the United States has aggregated more than the balance of trade during all the previous history of the Republic.

Go where you will, to England, to France, to Germany, Russia, Japan, China, to the isles of the sea, to wherever commerce has wended its way, you will find the products of American industry, the evidence of American skill, and the influence of American civilization.

Not, however, from all this that governmental policies alone have influenced these unrivaled triumphs. But who will maintain all of this advancement could have taken place under unwise governmental policies? True, governments can not in and of themselves create, develop, and make prosperous industries, but they can enact such laws and institute such policies as will lend a helping hand to manufactures, to agriculture, to labor, and aid in developing the industries on which depend the prosperity of the Nation and the welfare of the people. Such have been the policies for the past twelve years.

ARTICLES SOLD ABROAD CHEAPER THAN AT HOME.

The criticism is often made that some of our manufactured articles or products are sold abroad cheaper than at home, or below market prices. That practice does not characterize solely the manufactured products of this country. There is not a progressive nation in the world some of the manufactured articles of which are not sold abroad cheaper than at home. This is true of Germany, France, and even of free-trade England.

The percentage of our manufactured articles so sold abroad cheaper than at home is so small in comparison with the aggregate exports as to hardly deserve discussion, and would not but for the fact that dignity has been given to the transaction by persistent opponents of the protective system. It has been explained time and time again that this small percentage so sold may be surplus stock, or be goods that are out of date, or may be for the purpose of gaining a new market or holding a market against strong competition. But it must be remembered in this connection that when goods are so sold the American workingman and farmer are not the losers but the gainers. These goods have been manufactured at the same rate of wages as those sold at home. They have enabled our factories to keep their fires going month after month; to keep their workmen employed without cessation, and thus to keep the home market for the farmer whose products are necessary for the support of those so engaged in manufacturing industries. Moreover, this system is not a question of tariff but a pure question of business. It is practiced by free-trade countries as well as protective-tariff countries; by the manufacturer whose product is not protected, as well as by those whose product is protected; by merchants who make special inducements for out-of-town people. It is a plain business transaction, practiced by nearly all engaged in any one of our diversified industries, and will doubtless continue so long as industries are prosperous.

TARIFF AND THE TRUSTS.

But, again, the criticism is sought to be established that the tariff is responsible for trusts. The word "trust" is undoubtedly oftentimes applied to combinations which are not in reality trusts. All concede that in our industrial development combinations are necessary. But when these combinations result in, or their purpose is to result in, limiting production, stifling competition, and controlling prices they constitute a trust and should be regulated by law. It is not disputed that in this, as in every country reasonably prosperous, there are some of these combinations known as "trusts." If, however, our system of tariff is responsible for such combinations or trusts, then why is it that they exist in other countries? Why in Austria, in Italy, in Greece? Why do they exist in France and Germany? Why in free-trade England should trusts have existed as they have for over half a century?

The truth about it all is that we are not the only nation that suffers from trusts. They have existed in free-trade and protective-tariff nations. They have existed under republican and monarchical forms of government. They are not the result of political, but commercial, conditions. The commercial world at present is a world of combinations. Business and commercial industries are making busy the cities and dotting alike the hills and valleys. Trade and commerce are spanning continents and crossing seas. River, ocean, and railway transportation is facilitating the interchange of the markets of the world and making nations next-door neighbors. Leading in all this advancement is the United States. We are the greatest agricultural, manufacturing, and industrial nation in the world, but our triumphs have invited our trials. We want the prosperity, but we do not want the evils of the trusts, and so the problem is how to retain the prosperity and regulate the combinations, eliminating the evils.

Various remedies have been urged. That most strenuously advocated by the opponents of a protective tariff is to take the duty off from so-called "trust-made" articles. What would be the result of this?

Take, as an illustration, the corporation which seems to be for the present the special object of attack—the United States Steel Corporation. I am neither the advocate nor the defender of this combination. Whether it be a trust or not, I know not. But, for the purpose of applying the remedy, let it be conceded that it is. Take the duty off from these trust-made articles. When you come to that, however, you find in each case independent competing industries in the same line and manufacturing the same products. These independent industries employ hundreds of thousands of men; pay out annually millions of dollars in wages. When you apply the remedy to the trust-made article you must almost necessarily apply it to the article manufactured by the independent industries. The trust could stand it better than the independents. If it crippled the trusts, it would virtually ruin the independent industries.

The remedy does not lie in this direction, but rather in the enactment of effective laws and their faithful execution, such as are now upon the statute books and some of which should be supplemented and made still more effective.

There are 37 States in the Union which have enacted anti-trust laws. The national statute books contain, among others, five important laws which in their bearings may be considered antitrust laws, viz: The Sherman antitrust law, the interstate-commerce law, the publicity law, or the law creating the Department of Commerce and Labor and giving to the Secretary of the department authority to demand of corporations reports in detail for the purpose of ascertaining whether they are or are not trusts; the Elkins rebate law, preventing rebates by railroads in freight rates; and the Hepburn railway rate law, enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and more effectively placing common carriers under government control. These are among the wise and effective enactments which may be properly termed "anti-trust laws."

By virtue of these laws many actions have been brought in the courts to regulate combinations and eliminate trusts. The iron-pipe trust has been dissolved, the Northern Securities trust dissolved, and the beef trust regulated. Actions have been brought, some of which have been successfully prosecuted and others are pending against various railways for rebating, against the American Tobacco Company, against the Standard Oil Company, and so forth. Fines have been imposed in excess of half a million dollars, exclusive of that against the Standard Oil Company, which is still in litigation. In short, more has been accomplished during the past seven years in regulating illegal combinations and eliminating trust from our industrial system than in any seventy-five years of our previous history.

These trusts do not grow up in a night. They can not be destroyed in a day, unless in destroying them you destroy prosperity. The effective way of solving this problem is not so much through the revision of the tariff as the enactment of wise and effective laws and by their faithful and impartial execution, not in a way to injure legitimate industries, not in a way to oppress American labor, not in a way to turn backward the tide of prosperity, but in a way to dissolve the trusts and at the same time retain the prosperity which is making for the happiness and welfare of all the people.

PENDING BILL.

I have discussed our wonderful industrial progress under a protective system, not for the purpose of arguing that in all cases present rates of duty should be maintained, but rather for the purpose of illustrating the wisdom of adhering to the system, while not being wedded to distinct schedules. It is doubtless true that changed industrial conditions indicate the

wisdom of a revision of some of the schedules of our tariff laws, and it is likewise true that some of our industries have so advanced that present rates of duty are not needed to insure their future safety and progress.

The history of tariff revision demonstrates that the Republican party, when in power, has never failed to revise the tariff when changed industrial conditions or their relationship to the commerce of the world indicated the wisdom of such revision. It has eight times, in whole or in important part, revised the tariff, and the test of experience has proved each revision to have aided the advancing progress of the country.

We are now again engaged in revising the tariff, not the Nation's industrial policy, but the tariff on which that policy is based. This is being done in fulfillment of the pledges given to the people. The last national platform adopted at Chicago declared:

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries. We favor the establishment of a maximum and minimum rate, to be administered by the President under limitations fixed by law, the maximum to be available to meet the discrimination by foreign countries against American goods entering their markets, and the minimum representing the normal measure of protection at home, the aim and the purpose of Republican policy being not only to preserve without excessive duties the security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-workers of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system.

This declaration was supplemented by the pledge of the candidate, now President Taft, both prior to his election and subsequent thereto in his inaugural address, in which, speaking of tariff revision, he said:

The matter of most pressing importance is the revision of the tariff in accordance with the promises of the platform upon which I was elected. * * * This should secure an adequate revenue and adjust the duties in such a manner as to offer to labor and all industries of the country, whether of the farm, mine, or factory, protection by tariff equal to the difference between the cost of production abroad and the cost of production here, and have a provision which shall put in force by executive determination of certain facts a higher or a maximum tariff against those countries whose trade policy toward us equitably requires such discrimination.

In framing this bill, it is important that in imposing duties upon imports they must be sufficient to raise the revenues necessary for the support of the Government. The situation which confronts the country to-day is far different from any at the time of any revision since the war tariffs. We are confronted at this time with an annual deficit amounting to about \$100,000,000, this deficit being due to the fact that during the past year our imports have largely fallen off, probably much affected by the contemplated revision of the tariff, which has made business interests uncertain as to the future, and also our internal revenue has been materially decreased. Up to the time of the so-called "panic" of somewhat more than a year ago our revenues were more than sufficient to meet our expenditures. I give the receipts and expenditures since the adoption of the Dingley tariff, which show, I think, as a whole, that the revenue was sufficient to meet the ordinary expenditures of the Government:

Receipts and expenditures in the United States.

Fiscal year.	Net ordinary receipts.	Net ordinary expenditures.	Excess receipts.	Excess expenditures.
1898.....	\$405,321,335	\$443,368,583	-----	\$38,047,248
1899.....	515,960,620	605,072,180	-----	89,111,560
1900.....	567,240,852	487,713,792	\$79,527,060	-----
1901.....	587,685,338	509,967,353	77,717,985	-----
1902.....	562,478,233	471,190,858	91,287,375	-----
1903.....	560,396,674	506,099,007	54,297,667	-----
1904.....	540,631,749	582,402,321	-----	41,770,572
1905.....	544,274,685	567,278,913	-----	23,004,228
1906.....	594,454,122	568,784,799	25,669,323	-----
1907.....	663,140,334	578,903,748	84,236,586	-----
1908.....	599,895,703	659,552,125	-----	59,656,392
Total.....	-----	-----	412,735,996	251,589,970

Total excess receipts..... \$412,735,996
Total excess expenditures..... 251,589,970

Surplus receipts over expenditures, 1898 to 1908,
inclusive..... 161,146,026

Whether under a continuance of the Dingley tariff, in case we should return to normal conditions in the industrial world our revenues would be sufficient, it is not necessary to consider; but we must, in the adoption of the new schedules and the new general revision that is taking place, see to it that the rates of duty are such as, added to our internal and other sources of revenue, will give us sufficient income to meet our liabilities. It is estimated that under the pending bill the revenues will aggregate

\$335,000,000, which, added to our postal and other sources of revenue, will be sufficient to meet ordinary liabilities. This estimate, of course, can not be made with mathematical precision, as the exact revenues that any tariff law may produce are, and must be, to some extent, until put in force, uncertain. No statesman, however farsighted, can judge sufficiently of the future in this respect to frame a bill with exact knowledge of results. It is a problem in itself difficult to solve, and in solving it we have to judge of the experience of the past and the probabilities of the future and be, as far as possible, certain that the results will give sufficient revenue for the necessary support of the Government.

Having framed the bill so that we are reasonably sure of this result, we should go further and see to it that such duties are levied as will give to our farmers, manufacturers, miners, and labor protection against the lesser cost of production abroad and a fair return for capital invested. This is in accordance with the pledges made. Anything else would be to stay our industrial progress. It is not an excessive, but a reasonable, protection and should be meted out to the manufacturers, to labor, and to the farmers, and, in fact, to all engaged in our diversified industries.

The policy of a protective tariff is oftentimes made the subject of criticisms because of the protection it gives to manufacturers. It has been frequently urged that excessive rates of duty have enabled them to reap fabulous fortunes. These criticisms have, perhaps, been justified in some isolated instances, but not to the extent that would make general criticism well founded. Many of our important manufacturing industries are to-day doing business on a close margin and reach reasonable profits only through the magnitude of their enterprise. It must be remembered that these manufacturing industries necessitate the investment of large capital; that they are peculiarly dependent upon the vicissitudes of trade, which are frequently changing the volume of supply and demand. They employ labor. They aid in furnishing a market for the products of the soil. The fact that our commerce reaches every nation and clime is due in no small part to the fact that we are the greatest manufacturing nation in the world.

Labor constitutes the major portion of the entire cost of production of every article we consume, whether it be a product of agriculture or an article of manufacture. It is not necessary to discuss the relative wages and conditions of the laboring people of this and other lands. It is an established fact that the American laboring man, native and naturalized, is better employed, better paid, better clothed, better housed, better educated than are those of any other nation beneath the sun, and one of the principal causes for this is that our industrial policy is such that it furnishes employment for labor.

Agriculture is the basic industry of prosperity. It is the industry on which all other industries are more or less dependent. In earlier days the American farmer farmed it for the home and near-by market. To-day he farms it also for distant and far-away markets. The agricultural exports in the last five years have been more than sufficient to turn the balance of trade in favor of the United States and against foreign nations. But after all it is the home market that most benefits the farmer, and in framing the schedules of this bill the tariff rates should be so adjusted that they will protect him from foreign competition in that market.

I have referred thus briefly to these industries by way of emphasizing the importance of so framing the schedules in the proposed bill as to bring them within the rule of equalizing the cost of production in the United States and abroad. In applying this rule, not of excessive but fair protection, we should keep in mind the consumer and that he should be protected from excessive rates. In other words, in so far as consistent, equalizing the cost of production here and abroad, he should be protected against the imposing of excessive rates on the products and articles which enter into his daily necessities. The resultant effects of this measure, or tariff revision, will come home to every community and every individual in this broad land. All are to be affected by it, both as producers and consumers, and as we protect the interests of the producers we should also protect the interests of the consumers.

But of the separate schedules and provisions of the pending bill, time is not mine to speak either in detail or at length. That it is not a perfect bill would be conceded by its framers. There never was and never will be a perfect tariff bill. That would be impossible in a tariff affecting, as this does, over 4,000 items.

The agricultural schedule, always principally important in a tariff bill, does not, so far as strictly agricultural products are concerned, very materially differ from that of the present law. The duty on barley is reduced from 30 to 15 cents per bushel, but the present duty has not resulted in developing a barley

industry, especially in the State of New York, that being to a great extent, a dairy locality and the barley grown being for home consumption. The duties on the most important agricultural products remain substantially as they are in the present law, including those on dairy products, which, in the State of New York and many other States, is the principal branch of that industry. The fact that present duties have proved beneficial may be taken as assurance that their continuance in the pending bill, if enacted into law, will prove equally beneficial to this master industry.

But, while this similarity characterizes these strictly agricultural schedules, it does not apply to many other schedules and provisions. This bill as a whole differs materially from the Dingley bill. It is, as was intended by its framers, a revision downward. While in 30 paragraphs of the bill, the duties have been raised, in 130 they have been lowered, showing, as stated, that the revision has tended to lower rates of duty and to materially enlarge the free list.

As stated, in 30 paragraphs there have been increases in duties; but a careful examination of the bill will show that while some of these increases have been to protect certain industries not adequately protected, and to remove from the free to the dutiable list certain articles or products for protection or revenue, most of the increases have been upon products or articles of luxury. An exception to this may be found, however, in the duty of 8 cents a pound placed on tea, and which does not seem to be justified. Coffee, as in the present law, is placed on the free list, and should be without countervailing duty, and, as it seems to me, tea should likewise be upon that list, and some other article less necessary to the consumer should be found to supply the needed revenue. But, taken as a whole, the increases in these 30 paragraphs are mostly on so-called "luxuries" which do not necessarily injuriously affect the consumer.

But more notable than the increases are the reductions of duty. These are contained in 130 paragraphs of the bill. Prominent among them is the iron schedule. Iron ore is placed upon the free list, and the duties on steel rails, billets, nails, and other articles in these schedules are reduced. These industries constitute one of our greatest manufacturing industries, but it is doubtless true that they have so far developed that they no longer need the present rate of duty for their protection. Their products are necessary to our home life and in all the avenues of our industrial activities, and they should come to the consumer at reasonable prices. The difference in cost of production here and abroad, with a reasonable profit to the producer, should measure their protection, and the rates in the bill will doubtless satisfactorily prove that measure. The same reasoning might, with equal force, apply to the wool, the lumber, and many other schedules on which duties are reduced.

But I think a careful examination of the bill will justify the assertion that the reductions contained in the 130 paragraphs are mainly on articles or products which enter into the necessities of life. A detailed discussion of these items or articles is not here intended. That would be superfluous, in view of the masterly speech of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE], whose name this bill justly bears.

A tariff bill is always, in general results, somewhat a compromise. There never was and there never will be a tariff bill in which every single item or duty on more than 4,000 articles can be absolutely defended and demonstrated as just. It is easy to point to this item and say it is in the interest of the producer and a tax on the consumer, or to that item and say it is the sacrifice of an industry, and so in every case to characterize as a whole the bill. But in justice to both the producer and consumer, it must be looked at as a whole, and the average effect must be the standard upon which correct judgment is reached. One duty will seem to be in favor of the consumer; another more especially in favor of the producer. But when we come to the general result, both producer and consumer are mutually interested, and we realize the fact that it is not a separate item or duty standing alone that in the end most affect the community and the country, but it is the resultant effects of all that produce the greatest good to the greatest number, and it is upon that rule that final judgment must be rendered.

CUBA AND THE PHILIPPINES.

This bill provides for the continuance of the treaty of reciprocity between the United States and Cuba. This continuance is justified both by commercial advantage and, but still more, by the rule of obligation which makes us to a great extent sponsor for the future of the Republic of Cuba. The year prior to the ratification of that agreement our trade and commerce with Cuba, including exports and imports, aggregated \$80,289,658.

The year following its ratification, 1904, it aggregated \$117,595,336, an increase of \$37,305,679. During the past year,

1908, it was \$121,566,151, an increase over the year prior to its ratification of \$41,276,493, notwithstanding the unhappy internal conditions in Cuba, which prevented the full and natural operation of this treaty. But beyond all commercial change there is a reason more binding for the full and free continuance of this reciprocity treaty. We are bound to that people by a peculiar and what should be a lasting tie. The future of the Republic of Cuba will always be associated with the American name. There is no rule of right by which that treaty can be revoked. Every dictate of justice and humanity demands its full and free continuance.

Also, the bill provides for partial reciprocity with the Philippine Islands, to wit: That hereafter all products wholly the growth of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States shall be admitted free of duty, limited in any fiscal year as follows: Sugar to the amount of 300,000 gross tons; wrapper tobacco to the amount of 300,000 pounds; filler tobacco, 3,000,000 pounds; cigars to the number of 150,000,000. This is tardy and but partial justice to the Philippine Islands. These islands came to us as the unbidden fate of war. We have accepted the trust and are leading that people to a higher and better civilization; and whatever may be the ultimate status of the Philippine Islands, this people are our wards, and justice and right demand that we should extend to them this relation, which would tend to their commercial and industrial development.

CANAL BONDS.

Further, the bill provides for the issue of \$40,000,000 of bonds to reimburse the Treasury for \$40,000,000 paid for the property of the New Panama Canal Company. Already legislation enacted for the construction of the Panama Canal has provided for the issue of \$130,000,000 of bonds. This issue does not include the \$40,000,000 paid out of the Treasury for the original purchase of the Panama Canal Company, and this provision for the issue of \$40,000,000 of bonds is to reimburse the Treasury for that amount, thus providing for the purchase and construction of the canal by a bond issue.

The construction of the Panama Canal is the greatest work of the ages. For four centuries the magnitude of this task dazed capitalists and puzzled nations. The United States has undertaken and will carry to successful completion this great work which is to link ocean to ocean and be for the world a highway of commerce. It is a wise policy that provides for the construction of this work by the issue of bonds and gives to the revenues of the canal, when in operation, and to posterity the opportunity of, at least in great part, paying for this work. The benefits are not only for the present, but for coming generations, and there is no reason why one generation should bear an unequal share in the cost of this great undertaking.

MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM.

The bill is a new departure in tariff revision, in that it provides a maximum and minimum tariff. The minimum is the regular schedule of rates for the purpose of revenue and protection and available to any nation that does not discriminate against the United States. The maximum, which is, on the average, about 20 per cent above the minimum, is the schedule of rates applied to the products or articles of any nation that discriminates against imports from this country or fails to give us the same benefits given to the most-favored nations in their tariff schedules.

The bill also provides for the termination of existing reciprocity treaties in good faith and by giving the requisite notice for such termination provided for in such treaties. These provisions of the bill still recognize the principle of reciprocity. Reciprocity is a Republican doctrine. It was advocated and put into form by some of the greatest leaders and statesmen, among them James G. Blaine, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, Nelson Dingley. They never considered reciprocity inconsistent with protection. Both the tariff laws of 1890, known as the "McKinley law," and the present tariff act, known as the "Dingley Act," were framed with special reference to making applicable to their provisions the doctrine of reciprocity, and it is a significant fact that under both of these acts reciprocal trade relations were entered into with other nations. We have reciprocity treaties providing for such relations with France, Germany, Spain, Switzerland, Portugal, Russia, and other nations. If the provision in this bill providing for maximum and minimum rates was to do away with the principle of reciprocity it would not receive my support, for I believe in the principle and that its resultant effects have been beneficial to our trade and commerce. But it is broadening the application of that principle. Its purpose is to extend our foreign trade and to secure from trade rivals fair treatment for the American exporter. In exchange for the most-favored nations' privileges we give the most-favored nations' privileges.

It is an invitation to the nations of the world to accept our minimum scale of duties, and in return for this that they must extend to us their minimum scale of duties. In other words, we propose reciprocal treatment with trade rivals, whether that treatment results in a minimum or a maximum scale of tariff duties.

The contention that this system will tend to create trade wars is not well founded. Great Britain is our greatest purchaser, and our trade relations with her will not be changed by these provisions. We also have a reciprocity agreement with Germany by which we share her minimum scale of duties. Other nations will be quick to realize the advantages of this, and to accept the privilege of our minimum schedules. It will, in my opinion, protect American markets and the American exporter by granting reciprocity only on the basis of the most-favored nation's privileges.

INHERITANCE TAX.

Another and radically new departure in tariff legislation is the provision which provides for inheritance taxes. This provision is modeled largely after the inheritance tax laws of the State of New York. That law provides for a tax on legacies or bequests to direct heirs of 1 per cent on sums over \$10,000, and 5 per cent on legacies or bequests to collateral heirs.

This bill provides for a tax on legacies or bequests to direct heirs of 1 per cent on sums over \$10,000 to \$100,000; 2 per cent on \$100,000 to \$500,000; 3 per cent on sums above \$500,000; and 5 per cent on legacies or bequests to collateral heirs on sums over and above \$500, with exemptions from tax to legacies or bequests to churches, religious, and kindred organizations and societies.

The justice of an inheritance tax need not be argued. Thirty-three States of the Union already have such taxes, and such a tax is levied by nearly every civilized nation in the world. It is based upon the principle that wealth should bear its proportionate share of taxation. The problem in many States of the Union has been how to justly reach personal property that did not bear its just share of taxation.

Further, the inequalities of taxation are oftentimes only too apparent. The burden falls too largely upon the householder, the farmer, or the person of moderate means, and too little upon those who have accumulated fortunes that class them as the well-to-do or rich. It is a fact well illustrated in every community that wealth does not bear its just proportion of the burden of taxation, and it has been sought to remedy this wrong and to equalize taxation through inheritance taxes, and also, in many States, notably New York, through a system of indirect taxation. There is justice in all of this. The burdens of taxation should be so equalized that wealth bears its full proportionate share. But the objection now is made that for the Federal Government to resort to this system of inheritance taxes results in dual taxation; that the system, in equity, belongs to the several States; that they have adopted and entered upon it, and that in equity it is the province and belongs to the States and that they should be entitled to the revenue derived therefrom; that for the Federal Government to seize upon and put into operation this system results in double taxation. It can not be denied that there is force in this argument. While the Federal Government has, in some instances, resorted to this system, they have been, in the main, measures of war necessity, as during the civil war and the Spanish-American war. As a federal system of taxation it could only be justified on the ground of exceptional and excessive need of revenue, which from other sources more equitable can not be obtained. Where resorted to it should be as an emergency and not as a permanent system so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

PULP AND PAPER.

While, as stated, in the main I am in sympathy with the provisions of this bill, there are schedules with which I am not in accord, some of which I have mentioned, and one of which I take the liberty of discussing somewhat at length, namely, the pulp and paper schedule.

These industries constitute by far the most important manufacturing industries in the district I have the honor to represent, and they are so closely allied to other industries that they affect to no small extent the entire people of the district, and, I may say, of northern New York. I realize the necessary relationship of these industries to the press, a most important agency in communicating thought, spreading information, and advancing civilization. Not only is the printing business, with all its kindred and allied relations, one of our greatest industries, but it has shown a greater increase in the last half century perhaps than any other. For instance, the increase of all industries from 1850 to 1905 was almost fifteenfold, while that recorded by printing and publishing was nearly thirty-fold.

As indicating the importance of these industries in the Nation, the State of New York and the district I have the honor to represent, I may say that, in capital invested, it is, I believe, the second manufacturing industry in the Nation. Reliable statistics show that the capital invested in this industry in the United States aggregates, in round numbers, about \$300,000,000; the annual output in value over \$200,000,000; the number of wage-earners directly employed over 60,000, and nearly 40,000 in output of raw material; the annual pay roll over \$40,000,000; the yearly product of paper of all grades about 4,000,000 tons. The industry furnishes to railways in freight over 20,000,000 tons annually.

In the State of New York alone the capital invested in these industries aggregates, in round numbers, about \$60,000,000; the wage-earners about 14,000, exclusive of those employed in output of raw material; annual wages paid, over \$7,000,000; annual value of product, about \$40,000,000. These figures are exclusive of investments in timber lands and official clerks and for salaries.

In the district I have the honor to represent, including the counties of Jefferson, Lewis, and Oswego, there are 28 pulp and paper mills. The capital invested in these industries aggregates about \$16,000,000, exclusive of \$11,000,000 invested in timber lands, with an annual pay roll of over \$2,000,000, exclusive of output of raw material, and value of product about \$11,000,000.

This brief statement shows the growth and importance of this industry and the necessity for its reasonable protection, if it is to be continued. We have at our very door what at any time may become an effective competitor in this industry. Canada, with her almost limitless timber lands, her water power, and facilities for the manufacture of pulp and paper, is coveting our markets; and if, through a revision of the tariff, she is given the opportunity, she will flood our markets with her product; and while the result may be to temporarily slightly reduce the price of paper, in the end, with our industries prostrated or forced to cross the line, she can dictate the price of paper and no benefit as to that would come to the American publisher or consumer.

These schedules in the pending bill are substantially those recommended by the committee which investigated the question of pulp and paper, known as the "Mann committee." And while I do not agree with some of the conclusions reached by that committee, I bear tribute to the distinguished chairman of that committee, whose ability and sincerity of purpose are recognized by the Members of this House and the country, and also to the other members of the committee, justly distinguished for their public service. The fact that I emphatically dissent from some of the conclusions of the committee as contained in the schedules does not deny me this expression of regard for the personnel of the committee.

The change of duties in these schedules from those in the present tariff are, substantially, that mechanically ground wood pulp, which now bears a duty aggregating about \$1.66 a ton, is admitted free from duty, and white print paper, cheaper grades, on which the present duty is \$6 per ton is reduced to \$2 per ton, nearly all other rates remaining substantially as in the present paper, conditional, as to paper, that all restrictions are removed on the exportation of pulp wood, wood pulp, or printing paper by any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government making such exportation to the United States.

Those restrictions, as they affect us, relate almost entirely to Canada. While the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and British Columbia have no restriction, Newfoundland has prohibition. Newfoundland has a timber area of 14,000 square miles. All kinds of timber, pulp wood, and so forth, must be manufactured in the colony.

Ontario, with a timber area of 51,000,000 acres, has prohibition against the export of timber from crown lands, nearly all of the area being crown lands.

Quebec, with a timber area of 328,000 square miles, levies a license tax of 40 cents per cord on pulp wood, cut on crown lands, to be manufactured in Canada; pulp wood, cut on crown lands, to be manufactured outside of Canada, 65 cents, which amounts to an export duty on pulp wood of 25 cents per cord.

As most of the lands in Quebec and Ontario are crown lands, and most of our importations of spruce come from Quebec, these restrictions, which directly affect the importation, must, under the provisions of the above tariff schedules, be removed before the rates of duty under those schedules become available for Canadian export to the United States.

Evidently, in framing these schedules, the committee had in mind substantially a reciprocal trade relation with Canada. That in return for free mechanically ground wood pulp and the reduction of from \$6 to \$2 per ton on white print paper Canada was to remove all restrictions from exports of raw material, wood pulp, pulp wood, or paper.

It is maintained, and with some force, that the spruce supply of the United States, exclusive of that beyond the Rocky Mountains, is limited to about 70,000,000 cords, while that of Canada, so far as reliable estimates are concerned, is practically unlimited; that the supply in the United States, exclusive of that used for lumbering and other purposes, would not be sufficient for the paper-manufacturing industries in the distant future, while that of the United States and Canada combined would be sufficient for all time to come. True, we are now drawing upon the Canadian spruce supply. Last year there was imported into the United States from Canada about 1,000,000 cords of spruce, and of that, into the district I represent, about 100,000 cords. While many of the industries have timber limits more or less extensive of their own, they conserved those by making importation of part of the spruce supply used. While there is force in the argument of the desirability of reciprocal trade relations, it must, however, be remembered that only about 3 per cent of our wood product enters into the manufacture of paper; and while Canada has a greater supply of spruce, the United States has the population, the industries, and, more than all, the markets, and a reciprocal trade relation should be based upon conditions which do not so far surrender those markets as to jeopardize the paper and kindred industries.

Right here centers the vital question involved in those schedules. Just the extent of the effect of the taking off of the duty on mechanically ground wood pulp on this and kindred industries may not be determined, but the capital and labor involved in that industry deserve recognition. The reduction of the duty on print paper from \$6 to \$2 per ton is disproportionate to the reduction on ground wood pulp, and what is there to justify confident belief that results will be beneficial to either or in the end result in cheaper paper to the consumer?

There has been a duty on white print paper since the organization of the Government. I here insert schedule of tariff duties:

Act of July 4, 1789, all paper, 7½ per cent.
 Act of August 10, 1790, printing paper, 10 per cent.
 Act of May 22, 1824, printing paper, 10 cents per pound.
 Act of August 30, 1842, printing paper, 10 cents per pound.
 Act of July 30, 1846, printing paper, 20 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of March 3, 1863, printing paper, 20 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of March 3, 1883, printing paper, sized, 20 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of March 3, 1883, printing paper, unsized, 15 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of October 1, 1890 (McKinley), printing paper, sized, 20 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of October 1, 1890 (McKinley), printing paper, unsized, 15 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of August 27, 1894 (Wilson), printing paper, sized, 15 per cent ad valorem.
 Act of July 24, 1897 (Dingley), printing paper, value not over 2 cents, three-tenths cent per pound—15 per cent—\$6 per ton.
 Act of July 24, 1897 (Dingley), printing paper, value not over 2½ cents, four-tenths cent per pound.

From this schedule it will be seen that the duty on white print paper is to-day practically as low as it has ever been. The duty in the present tariff law amounts to \$6 a ton, but about one-third the average rate of duties under the Dingley Act. It was practically the same under the tariff act of 1883; also the McKinley Act; also the Wilson Act; practically the same during the past thirty years, and yet during that period of time the price of paper has materially declined.

It would be relatively as just to credit the tariff with this reduction as to charge the tariff with being responsible for the present price. The prices of paper during all this period have fluctuated, as have the prices of other manufacturing products, but the net result has been a material decline. There has, however, been an increase during the past few years, but it must be remembered in connection with this that there has been an increase in the cost of production. Since 1890 the hours of labor in the industry have been reduced over 9 per cent, while at the same time the wages per hour have been increased 20 per cent. During this period the cost of pulp wood has increased nearly 50 per cent. In the fact, then, that the cost of material has increased about 50 per cent, that wages of those employed have increased at least 20 per cent, and that the hours of labor have been reduced 9 per cent there may be found in important part the cause of this increase in the price of paper. As further illustrating the added cost of production, it may be stated that at the St. Regis mill, located in the county of Jefferson, one of the largest and most modern mills in the State of New York, the cost of production of news print paper, excluding depreciation and interest, as shown by the books of the company, since 1902, has been as follows:

	Per 100 pounds.
1902	\$1.34
1903	1.39
1904	1.42
1905	1.55
1906	1.53
1907	1.60
1908 (January and February)	1.66

This statement, made by a most reliable corporation, and officered by able and conservative business men, establishes the fact of increased cost of production, which has been a material factor in the recent advance in the price of paper.

But it is now proposed by this measure to reduce the duty on white print paper from \$6 to \$2 a ton. In other words, a reduction of 66 per cent of the duty which has practically been in effect since the organization of the Government, and which is, as it stands to-day, but one-third the average rate of duties under the existing tariff law. What is there in either the past or present history of this industry to justify this sweeping reduction?

In good faith, the rule of equalizing the cost of production here and abroad, with reasonable profit to producer, should be applied to this as well as to other industries. What evidence is there that a duty of \$2 a ton will measure the difference in the cost of production of white print paper at home and abroad, especially in Canada, with a reasonable profit to American industries?

Again, where is the evidence that if the duty should be adequately protective it would, in the end, reduce the price of paper to the American publishers and the American consumers?

By reason of the difference in equipment of mills, their distance from timber lands, and in freight to markets it may be difficult to establish the exact difference in the cost of production here and in Canada. But sufficient facts, I think, can be established to demonstrate that \$2 per ton will not measure that difference.

First, as to wages. This is to a certain extent a controverted question, but I believe the facts bear out the assertion that while the difference in wages paid to skilled labor may not materially differ here and in Canada, the wages paid to unskilled labor are materially higher here than there. There are employed in these mills different grades of labor, differing in wages from \$4 to \$1.50 per day, and it has been demonstrated by competent evidence that the wages paid to labor in the woods is about 30 per cent higher in the United States than in Canada. So that, taken as a whole, the wages paid to labor in those industries is, I think, more in the United States than in Canada.

But take the cost of material in which all grades of labor enter. Of the products that enter into print paper, about 80 per cent is spruce or its product. The average cost of spruce in Canada during the past year was about \$6 per cord, and in the United States about \$9.50 per cord. The average cost of transportation of Canadian spruce to American mills is about \$3 to \$3.50 per cord. As it takes a cord and a half of spruce to make a ton of paper, it will be seen that there is in the material of spruce alone an advantage to the Canadian manufacturer of more than enough to wipe out the proposed duty of \$2 per ton. If it be argued that the Canadian producer has to pay a greater rate of freight to market his products, credit him with that, which was shown before the committee hearings to be 60 cents a ton to principal American markets, and you still have an advantage to the Canadian manufacturer of more than enough to wipe out the proposed duty, to say nothing of the increased cost to American manufacturers of the other products that enter into paper.

But still further than this, and as emphasizing the necessity for the retention of the present duties, the present duty of \$6 per ton has not been prohibitive of the importation of white print paper to the United States. During the six months ended December 31 last the imports of print paper from Canada amounted to 17,493,391 pounds, valued at \$335,637. The imports of print paper during the period mentioned from all countries amounted to 18,734,667 pounds, valued at \$445,472. From this it will appear that during the period referred to the imports from Canada amounted to over 93 per cent of the total imports from all countries.

Again, the imports of print paper from Canada during January, 1909, amounted to 2,267,226 pounds, valued at \$42,994. Should that rate of import continue, it would amount to, for the year 1909, 27,206,712 pounds, valued at \$515,928. Thus Canada, under the duty of \$6 per ton, has been materially and rapidly increasing her imports of print paper to the United States. In the light of these facts, who can question that, with the duty reduced to \$2 per ton, Canada, with her limitless forests and facilities for manufacturing, would become a vital competitor and flood our markets with her products of print paper, displacing in a large measure our industries and labor? It does not need a prophetic vision to see that this would be the resultant effect. The fact that she can increase her imports to the extent that she has under a duty of \$6 per ton demonstrates that \$2 a ton would be entirely inadequate as a measure of protection to our own industries and labor.

But, added to all this, to reduce this duty, as is proposed by this measure, is not in the interest of forest preservation. For

twenty years and over the question of forest preservation has engrossed the minds of the people of the State of New York and the country until it has become both a state and national question.

While some of our pulp and paper industries are without, most of them have timber limits of greater or less acreage, yet they have annually imported an important part of the raw material used. In doing this they have conserved forest preservation to the extent of their imports and protected their own timber limits.

But with the duty reduced as proposed in these schedules, Canada would become a vital competitor, and the competition would be so fierce that the owners of American timber limits would have to realize on their investments, and in order to meet Canadian competition they would be obliged to utilize these timber limits, and thus the result would be to destroy rather than to conserve forest preservation. This important fact should lend material force toward increasing the duty proposed.

But still further than all this, what certainty is there that these reductions of duty would result in cheaper white print paper to the American publishers and consumers? History would have to reverse itself if the crippling of American industries in the end resulted in lower prices. This was fully recognized in both the partial and final report of the Mann committee. In the preliminary report of that committee, made near the close of the first session of the last Congress, a majority of the committee reported as follows:

It would seem that for the American publisher to be assured of low prices for his paper, it is essential to maintain paper mills in the United States. Any policy that would give Canadian mills a preferential advantage over American mills in obtaining raw material at a lower price must inevitably result in the dismantling of American paper machines and the ultimate dependence of American publishers on Canadian mills.

In the final report made by the committee at the second session of the last Congress, the committee unanimously reported as follows:

It is not desirable to strike down or injure the present paper mills of the United States. To do so would be not only very expensive to the present paper-mill owners and employees, but would probably in the future enhance the cost and price of paper.

Here is recognized the fact that to insure reasonable prices to publishers and consumers, American industries must be protected; that to cripple these industries would not only be in the end to ruin the industries and deprive American labor of employment, but make Canada mistress of these industries, and in the end place the American publisher and consumer at the mercy of Canadian prices, and, once with a monopoly of the paper industry, who questions that the price of white paper would increase rather than decrease? Such, I believe, would be the result should this schedule be enacted into law.

There is manufactured of print paper in the United States nearly as much as elsewhere in the world. Nearly 50 per cent of that manufactured in the United States is manufactured in the State of New York, and a large proportion of that manufactured in the State of New York is manufactured in the district I have the honor to represent. So the effect of these proposed reductions comes right home to that section.

This will give an idea of the importance of the schedules to that section of the State, and I believe it can be substantiated by reliable proof, and, in fact, is generally conceded, certainly in that locality, that these industries during the past few years have not shared the general prosperity that has come to the other industries of the country. They have been doing business on a close margin and with small profits. They involve large capital and employ thousands of men at good wages; they are industries in the prosperity of which the entire people of that section are largely interested, and I earnestly urge upon the Congress that the final enactment of the schedules shall provide such duties as will give protection to these industries and to the labor which has and is developing them.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KNAPP. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. What is the matter with the industry—what is the cause for the decline?

Mr. KNAPP. I do not say that there is any decline. I say they are doing business on a close margin with limited profits.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. They can not stand without protection; they are not strong enough to stand alone, as I understand the gentleman.

Mr. KNAPP. Not if you give the Canadian manufacturer an advantage; they can not stand it.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. There is no tariff on wood.

Mr. KNAPP. But there is an export duty on wood to the United States. Under any policy that would give the Canadian

manufacturer an advantage over the American manufacturer, it would be to the injury of these mills.

While I am not in accord with some of the schedules in this bill and have spoken of one at length, still I am not in sympathy with that indiscriminate criticism of the bill that would seize on one item or schedule as characterizing the whole measure as ill advised. I believe that in the main its resultant effects would be to supply the revenues necessary for the support of the Government and to promote industrial prosperity beneficial to the people. A general tariff revision always works temporary industrial depression. What is demanded by the great business interests of the country is not continued agitation, but the speedy enactment into law of a tariff measure which recognizes the principle of protection to American industries and labor. With that accomplished, there will be a revival and a renewal of that unrivaled industrial progress and prosperity which has in the past and will in the future characterize the United States.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to see so many empty seats in the House, but I prefer quality to quantity. [Laughter.] Anyone who knows the difficulty of compiling a tariff bill such as the one before us must say, if he wants to be fair, that the committee after all did a pretty good job. Yes; their work was well done. Of course, the great trouble is that all human beings are selfish. It was the same with the clothing dealer who had stolen from him a coat hanging outside of his store. He ran to catch the thief, but could not reach him. Finally he met a policeman, and the policeman ran with him, but both were unable to catch the thief. The policeman pulled a revolver and was on the point of shooting the thief when the clothing dealer said "Shoot him in the pants, the coat is mine." [Laughter.] We are satisfied to hit the pants of other interests, but we must not hit the coat of our own industries. [Laughter.]

Now, they may say that I am a little bit selfish in saying that the duty on barley ought to be a little higher than the committee has placed it. It is not for the reason that much barley is raised in my State, but if I had to decide for the brewers or the farmers, I would say give the farmers the advantage, because the brewers do not need it. [Applause.]

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KNAPP] spoke of paper. That reminds me that I have some paper factories in my district, and I am not speaking from a selfish standpoint when I suggest a change in the schedule as it appears in the present tariff bill. I do not believe that the tariff as it was left on print paper, at \$2 a ton, is sufficient protection; and I believe the time will come, when the American competition is ruined, that then the publishers will pay more for their paper than they are paying to-day.

There is one matter that I am particularly interested in, because I started the fight a year or more ago. I want to see the little "petroleum joker" removed from the tariff bill.

The words in one of the popular songs of the day give a fair illustration of the experience of the little petroleum or Standard Oil joker in the present tariff bill.

These words would be very applicable to the petroleum item if changed as follows:

I walked right out
And turned around
And walked right in again.

I had the positive assurance that the cunning little proviso which has served its purpose for so many years had been put out of existence by the Ways and Means Committee and buried, and now you may imagine my astonishment when, in looking over the new tariff bill, I found the joker resurrected, again standing before me in all its wickedness.

Yes; the little joker is again in evidence, ready to continue the work of taking twelve to fifteen millions of dollars out of the pockets of our people every single year and adding it to the vast profits of the greatest trust on earth.

This little joker does not to any extent benefit our Treasury, nor does it bring us any revenue, but it does exact 3 to 4 cents more per gallon out of the consumers of oil in this country than the Standard Oil Company, in competition with Russian oil, sells the same article for in Europe.

This was clearly shown by an investigation held a few years ago before the United States Commissioner of Corporations.

From his report the following facts are gleaned:

Russia's oil supply in 1900 exceeded that of the United States by over 12,000,000 barrels.

It is the only oil-producing country outside of the United States that, in addition to supplying its own needs, has a large surplus to sell to other countries.

In spite of the fact that a high tariff protects the Russian oil companies against the intrusions of the Standard Oil

Company into their home market, they do not take advantage of this protection by charging their people unreasonable prices for their product.

Such, however, under the protection afforded by the resurrected little joker, is constantly being done by the Standard Oil Company, and the American people are the sufferers to the extent of many millions of dollars each year.

In 1903, when the average price of American oil in the United States was 11 cents per gallon, the New York export price was 6 cents per gallon, and the American oil was sold in London for 8½ cents, or 2½ cents per gallon less than the United States oil monopoly was furnishing it for in Chicago, Washington, or any other American city.

In other words, this great trust was selling, and is still selling, its product cheaper to foreigners than to American citizens, even after adding the expense of commission and transportation across the ocean.

In 1905 the difference in price was even greater than two years previous—9½ cents in American cities and 5.8 cents in England.

Yes, with the aid of that proviso in our former tariff laws, all foreign products were kept out and our people left at the mercy of that ever-hungry oil monopoly.

Figuring that one-half of the production of mineral oil in the United States was consumed at home, and that on an average of 2 cents per gallon more were charged the American citizens than the people of European countries, we find that within ten years the little joker has brought to the coffers of the Standard Oil Company an extra profit of \$133,943,880.

No wonder that, according to statistics, the great monopoly was able to make a profit of \$490,315,000 in eight years.

In summing up, the United States Commissioner of Corporations says:

Whatever view may be taken as to the advantage of a great combination in furthering the export trade, it is entirely clear that the advantages derived by the American people from that trade are very small compared with the disadvantages imposed upon them by the Standard's monopoly at home. American consumers might, for the sake of maintaining a large foreign trade and thereby benefiting American industry, be willing temporarily to pay prices a little higher than are charged for the same product abroad. That American consumers, however, should be compelled to pay prices so high that, when an immense quantity of oil is sold by the Standard in foreign countries on the basis of little or no profit, the total profit on domestic and foreign business combined should be 50 or 60 per cent per annum on its capital is an obvious injustice.

The prices charged by the Standard Oil Company in the United States are, on the average, altogether excessive, and they have greatly increased during recent years.

With a profit of 50 to 60 per cent on its capital, the Standard Oil Company would not have felt the payment of the \$29,000,000 fine for unlawful rebating as much as a man of limited means in paying a fine of \$10 or \$25 for committing some unlawful act, but as the result of engaging the best of legal talent a hole was found for the great trust to crawl through and escape the payment of any fine.

I do not know what induced our Ways and Means Committee to leave in the proviso, in the face of the many protests from the American people, but I suppose the same well-paid lawyers that pleaded for the great trust in the courts succeeded in convincing the members of that committee that the little joker must be replaced in the bill to save the Standard Oil Company from financial ruin.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Does the gentleman not think that perhaps the position of Mr. John D. Rockefeller in the last election had something to do with it?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I do not know, sir.

The few so-called "independent companies," handling about 15 per cent of the output, perhaps urged that the joker be left in, yet every one of these companies is entirely at the mercy of the Standard Oil Company, not one of them being able to continue in business one day if the great trust did not think it to its advantage to let them live and do its bidding.

The American producer of crude oil is put forth to shield the Standard Oil Company, while not one of them would be affected by the removal of the little joker.

The great monopoly, no matter what its earnings, was never known to pay more for crude oil than it was obliged to pay.

If any of the Members of this House expect to find a soul in this corporation, they make a serious mistake.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I dislike very much to interrupt the gentleman, but I am deeply interested in the statement that he made, and I hope it will not disturb him to ask him this question. I would

like to hear the gentleman a little further on the proposition that it will not affect the independent producer at all. I am anxious to get all the information I can on that proposition.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. The independent refiners? There are only 15 per cent of them.

Mr. FERRIS. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. I think it is about 80 per cent.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Oh, the gentleman means the producer of the crude oil?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Does the gentleman think that the Standard Oil Company, with 55 to 60 per cent interest on their investment now, would pay less for crude oil if by striking out the countervailing duty the Standard Company is obliged to sell oil to Americans at the same rate as it is now selling to the people of Europe?

Mr. FERRIS. My understanding of the gentleman's statement was this: That removing the duty on oil would in no wise affect the independent producer. As I gathered the inference from the statement, it was that they were merely put out by the Standard Oil Company.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. The Standard Oil Company is the greatest producer, of course—85 per cent of all refined oils.

Mr. FERRIS. I am inclined to think that is not correct. I think there is about 80 per cent produced by the independent producer.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Of the crude oil; yes. The Standard buys that from them and it makes its own price.

Mr. FERRIS. I think that is true.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. If they were cut down in their profits somewhat, does the gentleman really think that they would pay the producers of crude oil any less? They would not be able to get it then.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman allow me one suggestion there?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. It is simply this, that the Standard Oil Company does not go out and hunt for oil or take any chances. That company occupies the position of the producer of the coal oil of this country because in every field it prices the crude product and takes it at its own price. They are in the attitude of the producer, and, instead of 20 per cent of the oil, really control 100 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of California. Will the gentleman permit a further interruption?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Yes; if I am given the time, I am willing to stay all night.

Mr. SMITH of California. It seems to me that the gentleman ought to make some distinction between the effect of repealing this countervailing duty on the crude oil and on the refined. Now, it is the fact, as everyone acquainted with the oil business of the country knows, that the Standard is not a producer of oil.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. No, not to any great extent.

Mr. SMITH of California. It is interested in buying oil, and if it could buy in Mexico or in Canada more cheaply than it could from any of the fields in the United States, it would be most happy to do it, and to have the countervailing duty repealed. How it may affect refined oil I am not caring to discuss at this time, but it is perfectly plain that it would be to the interest of the Standard to buy its crude stock where it could buy it the cheapest, and therefore—

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Does the gentleman not think the Standard Oil Company is doing it now? The Standard is not led by sympathy, but simply aims to buy where it can get it the cheapest.

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of California. And if the company can buy in Mexico cheaper than in the United States and bring it in without paying any duty, then I believe it would be glad to see the countervailing duty repealed.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. If the gentleman is disturbed about conditions in Mexico, I can read him something written by some one who knows Mexico can not supply us. Here it is:

OIL AND THE TARIFF.

Independent oil producers are worried lest reduction of the tariff on crude oil should enable the Standard Oil Company to engulf the producing branch of the trade.

The oil trust controls about 80 per cent of the refining business. The independent oil producers fear the trust may import Mexican petroleum and subject them to a price cut they can not stand. Or, at least, that is what they tell our legislators at Washington.

The oil trust, like the steel trust, owes its success to methods, processes, and special equipment which enable it to produce and market refined oil at prices that defy competition.

But, for two reasons, it is not at all likely to introduce Mexican petroleum into this country. In the first place, Mexican oil production is very largely in the hands of German and British capitalists. In the second place, Mexico does not produce enough oil for her own needs.

As long as perfection of process enables the Standard Oil Company to ship millions of dollars worth of its products into Mexico each year, in the face of a heavy tariff, American independent oil well men need not worry.

Mr. SMITH of California. I have read that article, but I think there are a good many things about the Mexico oil fields that the author of it does not know.

Mr. STANLEY. Does not the gentleman think that in the greater part of these crude oils, the oil wells of the United States, nominally owned by the independent producers, this oil is piped from the independent well to the refineries of the Standard, and this extensive piping serves a double purpose? It destroys the individual initiative of the producers and prevents their selling to anybody but the Standard Oil Company. At the same time, it will prevent the Standard Oil Company from going into Mexico or the markets of Europe to buy oil, where they do not have the facilities for transportation.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That is true.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. Did I understand that the gentleman stated the price was entirely contingent on what the Standard Oil was willing to give?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I believe so.

Mr. WHEELER. Now, I have the honor to represent the District in which the Standard began its work. The first well producing petroleum is only 18 miles from my present home. It is just over the line in Crawford County. That was fifty years ago. The independent refiners were driven out in the beginning, but there are a good many of them to-day. There are 7 in one of the towns of my district, and I can think of two or three more independent refineries all of whom buy their oil separate and outside entirely of the Standard Oil Company. Some of them have put in pipe lines and pay a little better price than the Standard Oil Company, so that the industry, instead of being crowded and squeezed out so far as my district is concerned, is growing, and every person in it seems in favor of keeping that countervailing duty on oil. I have received no communication from the Standard Oil Company. From the independent refiners and small producers I have received innumerable letters, telegrams, and petitions in favor of retaining the countervailing duty. Yesterday I received a petition with 1,155 names urging keeping the countervailing duty on oil.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia. The same is true of the West Virginia field.

Mr. SIMS. Had not they rather have a straight ad valorem duty and no countervailing duty, say, of 20 or 25 per cent? That is the information that comes to me.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Some of the independent companies, perhaps reluctantly defending the Standard Oil Company, as they are forced to do, recently published a pamphlet in which it is stated that the output of the oil fields of Mexico would surely ruin the oil producers of the United States if the joker was removed from the tariff bill and Mexican oil allowed to come in untaxed.

I have it on good authority that this statement is considered a huge joke in Mexico; that their supply of oil is very limited, hardly sufficient to supply their own needs.

Mr. SMITH of California. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of California. How recent is the information upon which you base that opinion that the production is very limited in Mexico?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I got this about a week or two ago.

Mr. SMITH of California. Surely the writer had not heard from Mexico within six or eight months or a year.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. A circular published by the independent companies simply expresses a fear of a large output in years to come. It says that the principal oil fields in Mexico at the present time are at Ebano, where eight wells, some of them 2 years old, produce an average of about 1,000 barrels a day. This ought not to scare American producers. Remember that the circular was issued by the independent companies.

Mr. SMITH of California. By somebody who did not know anything about it. It is very well known in the West that a very large field, a very rich field, has been developed in Mexico that is just being brought out, and under exceedingly favorable conditions, as to royalties. Mexico is in the oil business.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. That must be very late, because this last year we exported to Mexico, in order to supply her needs, 17,523,446 gallons of oil.

Mr. SMITH of California. That may all be true.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. These matters all spring up at a given time—you know when we have the naval bill up we always hear of a war with Japan [laughter], and they come here with this great supply of oil in Mexico when the tariff bill is up. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. With pleasure.

Mr. STANLEY. Has Mexico an export duty on oil?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. No; only an import duty.

How scared the Mexican oil producers are of the Standard Oil octopus is evidenced by the fact that they induced their Government to place an import duty of \$0.63 on every barrel of refined oil brought into Mexico.

If it were true, as is claimed by the agents of the trust, that the supply of oil in Mexico is almost without limit, it would then be a source of regret that the people of this country were prevented from getting oil from so near by a point at somewhat reasonable prices.

With the little joker out of the way, probably not a drop more of oil would be sent into this country from Russia than at present enters the United States. The oil trust would keep out all foreign oil products by bringing their prices on a level, or perhaps a little below those of foreign competitors.

True, removing the little joker may reduce the annual profits of the Standard Oil Company from 55 or 60 per cent, as estimated by the United States Commissioner of Corporations, to perhaps 40 or 45 per cent, which will still be a very satisfactory return on the sum invested.

Great, however, will be the joy of the American people over the removal of the proviso that has forced them to pay excessive prices for so necessary an article as petroleum and its products.

The regulation of the trusts was one of the main planks in the Republican as well as in the Democratic platform.

After unsuccessful efforts by courts and commissions, I say let Congress regulate the Standard Oil trust by removing the little joker, and thus force the great monopoly to a decent treatment of the people of the United States.

There is no one in this House that is more in favor of protecting American industries and American labor than I am, but I am also in favor of giving protection to the American people against the extortions of the Standard Oil or any other trust. How patriotic this monopoly you see from the fact that the tin plate for the cans used in their export trade, to the amount of several million dollars a year, is purchased in England, and the tax is refunded to them under the drawback clause in the tariff bill. This, in the face of the fact that a number of our own tin plate factories and thousands of employees last year were kept idle. The 47 ships of the Standard Oil Company were all built in foreign countries and are sailing under foreign flags.

No Member of Congress can go before his constituents in the next election and defend his course if he voted to continue the proviso which enables the great monopoly to extort millions of dollars every year from the pockets of the American people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SMITH of California. If the duty were entirely taken off from oil, whence would come the importation that would reduce the price in this country?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Why, Russia would stand ready to furnish it to us. Russia eight years ago produced 12,000,000 barrels more than the United States did. They have an ample supply.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thought you stated a moment ago in the course of your remarks that Russia probably would not import oil.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. No; because the Standard will come down to a decent figure. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question, as he seems to be authority on the subject. Would it not be better to accept even a protective tariff duty on crude oil than to retain the countervailing provision with free trade in oil?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Certainly; if crude oil needs protection, I have no objection to a specific rate.

Mr. SMITH of California. The rate specific compared with Mexico, of course, is absurdly high now, \$1.84 a crude barrel, when oil is worth about 60 cents in California. A specific or direct protective duty is just as satisfactory as this, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I am very much of the same belief as the gentleman who occupies the floor, yet I want to get his position on this proposition. To what do you attribute the activity of

the independent producer? Do I understand from your remarks, directly or by inference, that they were tools of the Standard Oil Company and acted because they were forced to act, or are they deluded as to the merits of the proposition?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Oh, no. They are pretty clear-headed people, but they are forced to act as they are acting by the Standard Oil Company.

Mr. FERRIS. By reason of the Standard Oil Company owning the pipe lines, or what?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. In every way. Do you think that the Standard Oil Company, if it was not to its advantage, would let the independents live a single day? I do not believe the Standard would.

Mr. GILLESPIE. May I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. Certainly.

Mr. GILLESPIE. The gentleman stated at the beginning of his remarks that he had been assured that this joker was going out. Now, will the gentleman tell the House whether he got that from authority; and if so, what authority?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I considered it good authority.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the gentleman a question? How much revenue have we been getting out of the present countervailing duty?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. In about ten or twelve years between \$25,000 and \$30,000 of import duty. Those must have been samples that were sent over here. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARRETT. Out of even a protective duty upon the crude oil we would get more revenue than out of the countervailing duty, would we not?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I should not wonder. I believe we would.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman if he has discovered a similar joker in the coffee schedule as that he has so well explained as to the Standard Oil?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I was so occupied in looking into this little joker I could not look for any other joker.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I wish the gentleman would give an experience of a similar character as to the coffee schedule.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I will say that I am very much against jokers in any form. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I would like to ask the gentleman what percentage of the total cost of crude oil the labor conditions existing in its production bear?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. The gentleman can get that all in a report published by the Commissioner of Corporations. It is a report of about two or three thousand pages, and I read most of it, but I do not remember. I would not be able to answer that question.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. It is comparatively insignificant, is it not?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I suppose so.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia. Let me ask in what tariff legislation this little joker, or the like of it, first appeared?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. In the Wilson tariff bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. What did the Wilson bill provide?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. The Wilson bill provided that the duty be countervailing, but not more than 40 per cent; while, I will say, the present countervailing duty makes it all the way from 75 to 150 per cent.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia. Then, that little joker was similar to this one?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. The Democrats were to blame in the first place. The Republicans, however, made a serious mistake in thinking that the Democrats had anything that was really good. [Laughter.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. May I ask the gentleman a question on that matter? It has been brought out that this little joker first appeared in the Wilson bill. Was that in the Wilson bill as it passed the House or as it was enacted into law?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I was not in the House at the time and do not know.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. As a matter of fact, the Wilson bill as it passed the House might be chargeable to the Democratic party. The Wilson bill as it passed the Senate would not necessarily be classed that way. Is it not a fact that when it was put in it was understood that it was meant to rob the American people?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. It would be too bad if the Democrats understood it that way and still passed it. I understand both the House and Senate were Democratic at that time.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. In both the Democratic and Republican parties special corporations and special interests have some people that help them, and they get in their work even in Congress; and is it not a fact that the Republicans have let that little joker stay in there and put it in a worse form than when it first came in?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin permit me right there?

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I will yield to my colleague; yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I was in the House when the Wilson-Gorman bill was enacted into law. I was also in the House when the Wilson and Dingley bills became laws.

I do not believe that more than four men—and if four, I do not know who they were—knew that the joker was in either bill. I went on the stump and made several speeches, in which I was very careful to say that there was no tariff on coal oil. There is not a man on the floor of this House, I believe, but what made the same statement in stump speeches.

Mr. LANGLEY. I did.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Here is one.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN. I did so myself.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Nobody knew the joker was in the law except the men who put it in. How it was put in I do not know, but it was put in without the knowledge of but very few Members in either body; and then, to the surprise of everybody, somebody discovered the joker long after the Dingley bill had been passed and became a law.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. You object to it?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do object to it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And you admit that it is not necessary?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then why put it in the present bill?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If I get an opportunity, I will vote against keeping it in the present bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will we get that opportunity?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not know.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would like to extort from the gentleman his opinion as to whether we will get that opportunity?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You can not extort from me what I have not got to impart.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make some remarks upon this subject if there is no one else who is to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair knows of no one else to be recognized at this time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make some remarks upon this subject while it is being considered and occupies the attention of the press of the country and of the Members of the House at this particular juncture rather than wait until it may come up for debate again. I have never looked into the history of this countervailing duty very carefully, but I do not know why it should be called a "joker." It is written in the law in plain type and a plentitude of words to attract everybody's attention. Everybody knows that it has been the law for many years. To call it a "joker" is to intimate that it has some secret and special meaning which does not appear on its face.

Now, I fancy that the Mexican Government—and that is the one that I have in mind, for it is the great threatening nation in this matter—must have placed its present high duties on crude and refined oil for revenue purposes, for it is only within the last few years that this industry has been projected into that country, and while it was a buyer it surely would not put these very high rates on unless it felt that it needed the revenue it would get out of it. I think nothing can particularly justify the present rate of duty in our bill, as measured by the Mexican rate. As stated in a publication of recent date, they are paying \$1.84 duty a barrel for crude oil of 42 gallons to the barrel, and no one would undertake to say that the oil industry in the United States needed any such phenomenal rate of import duty for its protection. Oil at the well's mouth in California sells at 60 cents, and that is considered a very good price, and it does not need any protection equal to three or four times the cost of the oil.

Oil, more than any other product in the world, is the most difficult to move, but that is a factor that I may speak of a little later. It is true, of course, that a wonderful monopoly has grown up in this country in the transportation and in the refining and sale of oil. But it has been due chiefly to the favoritism which the Standard Oil Company has been able to enjoy in the transportation of oil. If the Hepburn rate law can be vigorously and fully enforced, the Standard Oil monopoly

will be broken up in this country as sure as the sun will rise to-morrow. It has no advantage over other people in the refinement of oil, and if others can get the same rates of transportation, they can distribute the oil; they are doing so now. The Standard Oil Company has had a strong competitor in the Union Oil Company, which is established in California, and in the last two or three years, when the agitation for fair treatment in transportation seemed likely to be realized, a refinery was built at Port Harford at a cost of a million and a half dollars for the purpose of treating oil and entering the markets of this country and of the world in competition with the Standard Oil Company. The Union Oil Company is extending its business all the time.

It has established a line of tank steamers to the Isthmus of Panama, it has laid a pipe line across the Isthmus, and has tank steamers on the Atlantic which are entering into active competition with the Standard Oil Company in all the markets of this country and of the world.

But the production of crude oil in this country is the small man's business; not exactly the poor man's business, for it takes considerable money, but it has drawn to itself the cooperation or pooling of more small sums of money in a common business than any business that I have ever known; and as it is carried on throughout the West now it is the business of the comparatively small capitalist. It is done almost entirely on the leasing of lands, not the purchase.

Mr. SIMS. From the standpoint of the producer, do you think it would be better to keep this bill as it is, or repeal the countervailing duty and put a straight duty on it?

Mr. SMITH of California. I will speak of that in a moment. Leases are frequently of only 5 or 10 acres each, and they drill 1 well to about 2 acres. So you see it is not a monopolistic or capitalistic affair at all. When a man secures a lease he capitalizes his company and proceeds to sell stock, and we all buy.

I have some now that I will sell to you if you want it. We gamble on the outcome of his territory, and every servant, and every workman, and every merchant, and every banker, and everybody else buys stock. If they get a well they make some money; and if they do not, why, they have had a good time anyhow. At any rate they go at it again the next opportunity that is offered, and the development of the great oil production in California, which now reaches into the millions and millions of barrels per annum, has been by the contributions of comparatively small capitalists, or people of comparatively small means.

Now, within the last year or two a very large and rich oil field has been discovered in Mexico. Any figures that were written six months ago are not worth the paper they are written on to establish the conditions of the business in that country. I am personally acquainted with gentlemen who have gone down there and secured exceedingly favorable concessions from the Mexican Government as to royalties and extent of territory, so that they are now becoming the strongest oil producers in the world. Under those circumstances, I say, the crude-oil producers of this country need some protection, just as much as the farmer and the timber men and the miner need some protection, to keep away the competition that has an unfair advantage in the situation.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Right there I should like to ask the gentleman why he needs that protection? Is it to enable him to get more for his oil than it is worth, or does the gentleman put it on the ground, as so many gentlemen do, that it is necessary to equalize the cost of labor in the production of the Mexican oil and the American oil?

Mr. SMITH of California. To equalize the cost of labor and also to equalize the cost of the territory, or the royalties that have to be paid in Mexico and in the United States for the privilege of drilling for oil. The Mexican Government has given these parties going in there of recent years extraordinary privileges in drilling for oil, and a very small royalty is exacted for it.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The American Government does not exact any royalty.

Mr. SMITH of California. No; but the American citizen gets his privilege of drilling for oil from another private citizen, and has to pay a greater royalty in order to produce oil than they have to pay to the Mexican Government.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Then the gentleman does take the position that he wants enough tariff to make the production of oil profitable?

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Whatever amount that may be?

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes, sir. I always write protection with a capital "P." I am not at all afraid of the word.

I want it for the protection of the comparatively small capitalists who are producing the crude oil in this country.

Now, so far as the Standard Oil Company is concerned, I am sure I have no occasion to defend it, but in my opinion if it were here now and had the decision of this question it would strike out this provision in the law with reference to countervailing duties. I want to be polite to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and yet I am inclined to use the word "absurd" when he says that Russia can invade this country with her oil, in competition with the Standard and other companies here, and beat down the price of oil. They would not get a mile inland until they met transportation facilities which the Standard Oil Company already has and marketing facilities in the way of tankage, and so forth, in the different cities with which they could not compete.

Our competitor in oil is Mexico, and the Standard is just as willing to buy there as in the United States; and if it could buy oil in Mexico cheaper than in the United States and bring it in here, it would do so and leave the American oil producer with his wells shut down and nothing doing at all.

This provision is in no sense in the interest of the Standard Oil Company as a transporter, refiner, or seller of oil, but it is in the interest of the producer.

As to the countervailing provision or a specific duty, I should say that in the logic of the thing I should favor a specific duty. No one can justify a duty of \$1.84 a barrel on crude oil and \$4 or \$5 or \$6 on refined oil; and if it should be the judgment of the committee and the House that that provision should be stricken out and a specific duty be placed on crude oil, it would satisfy the people of California probably better than this, and it would be more logical. It seems quite plain to me that if we pass this and adjourn, there is great probability that Mexico may call her Congress together and repeal her duty.

She no longer has any necessity for the duty, having discovered her own supply of oil, and it is no longer a revenue producer for her, and therefore she would be content to wipe it out that she might be permitted to get into our markets.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of California. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Can the gentleman inform us whether the House will be permitted to offer an amendment to this?

Mr. SMITH of California. I do not know; but if left to me, you would not have a chance to change many provisions of the bill. I am frank to say that. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. I would like to say to the gentleman that the specific or ad valorem duty would bring something into the Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes; if any oil came in.

Mr. SIMS. Of course, if any oil came in.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of taking any time of the committee, but I merely want to say that I am, to a small extent, responsible in urging the Ways and Means Committee to retain this countervailing clause in the bill. I do it in response to the request of thousands of men in my district who are engaged in the production of oil. I do it in behalf of 500,000 American citizens who are engaged in producing oil every day in the year, who are bringing out of the earth nearly half a million dollars worth of mineral wealth every day the sun rises, for the benefit of the American people. I know nothing of what the Standard Oil Company desires. I merely rise at this time to say that I have asked for time, and at the proper time shall endeavor to explain to the House the reason why the oil producers of the United States are in favor of having this small amount of protection retained in the bill.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I understood the statement to be made a few minutes ago by some one that this countervailing duty clause in the present bill and in the Dingley bill were the same as that in the Wilson bill. I remember having made an investigation about that, and I feel pretty sure that that statement is not correct.

Mr. VREELAND. I can say to the gentleman that the countervailing clause in the Wilson bill was the same as at present, except instead of making the duty the same as the country imposing the duty on American oil, it made a flat rate of 40 per cent against any duty imposed on American petroleum.

Mr. GARRETT. I thought that statement as a matter of historic interest should be corrected.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the

Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1438, the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of J. B. Martin, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Eugene L. Smith, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HAMILL, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for five days, on account of a death in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting a schedule of papers and documents not needed in the transaction of the public business (H. Doc. No. 3, pt. 2), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from consideration of the bill (H. R. 1618) granting an increase of pension to James F. Kilburn and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 4814) for the establishment of a national tubercular sanitarium in the State of Colorado for persons afflicted with tuberculosis—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 4815) to provide for the erection of an extension to the federal building at Springfield, Mo., and to appropriate money for the same—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4816) for the relief of postal employees—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4817) to amend an act to authorize the employment of volunteers to aid in enforcing the laws and protecting public property, approved March 3, 1863—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4818) providing for the taking over by the United States Government of the confederate cemetery at Springfield, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4819) to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, in relation to pensions, etc.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4820) to establish a biological and fish-cultural station in the Twenty-third Congressional District of Illinois—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4821) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4822) granting pensions to all enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the civil war or the war with Mexico—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 4823) to amend the law of patent designs—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4824) to acquire the manuscript of Charles Chaillé Long, containing an account of the unveiling of the McClellan statue—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4825) for the relief of the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 4826) providing for the exchange and payment by the United States of certain Pima County, Ariz., railroad bonds validated by Congress, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4827) to provide for the payment of certain railroad bonds of the county of Coconino which have been funded into territorial bonds of the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 4828) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lewisburg, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 4829) appropriating money to perform the work described in the special report of the California Débris Commission, with regard to future operations for the control of mining débris, improving navigability, and providing for the control of floods on the Sacramento and Feather rivers of California, dated June 30, 1907, and printed with the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4830) establishing regular terms of the United States circuit and district courts of the northern district of California at Sacramento, Cal.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 5152) to provide for the construction and maintenance of levees along the Mississippi River from Cape Girardeau, Mo., to the Head of the Passes by the Government of the United States of America—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 37) concerning the manuscript prepared by Charles Chaillé-Long containing an account of the unveiling of the statue of the late Maj. Gen. George B. McClellan—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 13) accepting the invitation extended to the Congress of the United States by the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Resolution (H. Res. 45) providing for the services of an attendant in the ladies' reception room of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Memorial of the legislature of Minnesota for clearing of channel of Minnesota River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Minnesota for canal between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the State of Oregon for the establishment of an American line of ships from the Atlantic coast ports to all Pacific coast ports via the Panama Canal—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4831) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Bukey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4832) granting an increase of pension to Christian Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4833) granting an increase of pension to George W. Samson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 4834) granting an increase of pension to William H. Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4835) granting an increase of pension to Flemin Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4836) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4837) granting an increase of pension to John W. Dickerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4838) granting a pension to James C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 4839) granting an increase of pension to Martin Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4840) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Sneath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4841) granting an increase of pension to John Willford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4842) granting an increase of pension to George M. Veach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4843) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4844) granting an increase of pension to William Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4845) granting an increase of pension to Peter Selner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4846) granting an increase of pension to James W. Titus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4847) granting an increase of pension to William H. Schearer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4848) granting an increase of pension to John Stallard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4849) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Reid—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4850) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4851) granting an increase of pension to Levi C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4852) granting an increase of pension to Martin Mullin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4853) granting an increase of pension to Stephen S. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4854) granting an increase of pension to John R. Kissinger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4855) granting an increase of pension to J. J. Babcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) granting an increase of pension to John Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4857) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Bedford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4858) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Boulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4859) granting an increase of pension to Ezra K. Barnhill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4860) granting an increase of pension to Jemima E. Callahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4861) granting an increase of pension to James M. Beeber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4862) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Cromwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4863) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Householder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4864) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Jenkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4865) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4866) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Horner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4867) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Heiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4868) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Hedges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4869) granting an increase of pension to David Hay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Fielding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4871) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4872) granting an increase of pension to Thomas V. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) granting a pension to Clark R. Parcel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4874) granting a pension to Peter G. Keely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4875) granting a pension to Charles M. Baughman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4876) granting a pension to Jacob Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4877) granting a pension to Napoleon B. Corus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4878) granting a pension to Jeremiah Hahn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4879) granting a pension to Matilda Merriker Goodrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4880) for the relief of Levi C. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4881) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Shaffer and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4882) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Philpott and to grant

him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4883) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles E. Campbell and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 4884) granting an increase of pension to William Wellman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4885) granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Marley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4886) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo M. Bartholomew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4887) granting an increase of pension to Elvira Knox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4888) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Traut—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4889) granting an increase of pension to J. L. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4890) for the relief of Mrs. Sallie B. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4891) for the relief of the heirs of Robert M. Williams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 4892) granting a pension to James M. Flynn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4893) granting an increase of pension to Samuel G. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 4894) granting an increase of pension to David M. Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 4895) for the relief of William Wooster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 4896) granting an increase of pension to Christopher T. Grinstead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 4897) granting a pension to Annie C. Almond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4898) granting a pension to Mary Ca-wood—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4899) granting a pension to William F. Myers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4900) granting a pension to Samuel Reeder—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4901) granting an increase of pension to John Bowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4902) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Chilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4903) granting an increase of pension to Lewis G. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4904) granting an increase of pension to Fillmore M. Brist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4905) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. William C. Fitzhugh, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COWLES: A bill (H. R. 4906) for the relief of E. M. Felts—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 4907) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. McClure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 4908) for the relief of Peter J. Van Zandt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4909) for the relief of Joseph G. McNutt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 4910) granting an increase of pension to Oran D. Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4911) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Northrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4912) granting an increase of pension to John Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4913) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4914) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4915) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Beeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4916) granting an increase of pension to Edward Beebe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4917) granting an increase of pension to Michael Campion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4918) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Borden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4919) granting an increase of pension to Gould B. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4920) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Hatch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4921) granting an increase of pension to William H. Watkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4922) granting an increase of pension to Harrison H. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4923) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Carlisle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4924) granting a pension to Mary Caroline Ellis Hargin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4925) granting a pension to Lucy A. Emerson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4926) granting a pension to Emily E. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4927) granting a pension to Sarah A. Huckman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4928) granting a pension to Mary J. Kitter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4929) granting a pension to Mary S. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4930) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Henry Shaver, erroneously made as to Company G, Forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of Santa Anna Wallace—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4932) for relief of former members of New York Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4933) for the relief of John Kurtz—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4934) for the relief of Liston H. Pearce—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4935) for the relief of the heirs of James Finnegan and the heirs of Thomas Nesdall, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4936) for the relief of Albert Edward Adam Engle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4937) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Horatio C. Patch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4938) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Pratt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4939) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Roach—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4940) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Russell S. Carter, alias Robert Carter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4941) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William S. Herrick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4942) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Ryan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4943) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Lucien H. Robertson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4944) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William M. Reals—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4945) to complete the military record of Joshua C. Warrick, and granting him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4946) to place on the pension roll the name of John H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 4947) for the relief of the heirs at law of William Coolidge, late of Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 4948) granting an increase of pension to William C. Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4949) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert H. Fellows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4950) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4951) granting an increase of pension to Henry Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4952) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin V. Carey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4953) granting an increase of pension to Nimrod T. Stoner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4954) granting an increase of pension to John W. Whalen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4955) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Baltzell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4956) granting an increase of pension to William S. Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4957) granting an increase of pension to Varnel G. Compton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4958) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Reiber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4959) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Huston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4960) granting an increase of pension to William H. Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4961) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4962) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Boles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4963) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Watts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4964) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Herrin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4965) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Estes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4966) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Armiston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4967) granting an increase of pension to T. M. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4968) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Rosborough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4969) granting an increase of pension to W. D. Cummins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4970) granting an increase of pension to George T. Clausen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4971) granting an increase of pension to John D. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4972) granting an increase of pension to F. L. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4973) granting an increase of pension to John A. McNeerney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4974) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4975) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Kibler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4976) granting an increase of pension to John E. McNeill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4977) granting an increase of pension to James M. Gullett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4978) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4979) granting an increase of pension to John A. Crozier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4980) granting an increase of pension to Michael Willman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4981) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Remington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4982) granting an increase of pension to John R. C. Bray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4983) granting an increase of pension to James A. Lowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4984) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Waters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4985) granting an increase of pension to Leander C. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4986) granting an increase of pension to Thomas K. Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4987) granting an increase of pension to William P. Carlock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4988) granting an increase of pension to William A. McNutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4989) granting an increase of pension to William S. Rosborough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4990) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Eckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4991) granting an increase of pension to John Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4992) granting an increase of pension to John Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4993) granting an increase of pension to Rolandus O. Longenecker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4994) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Vanderhoof—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4995) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. McCord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4996) granting an increase of pension to William Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4997) granting a pension to Alfred Levick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) granting a pension to Sarah Bolt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4999) granting a pension to Ellie Gaston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5000) granting a pension to W. J. Collins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5001) granting a pension to Prudence Simmons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5002) granting a pension to B. F. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5003) granting a pension to Sarah Highsmith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5004) granting a pension to Stephen A. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5005) granting a pension to Lee Monroe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5006) granting a pension to J. H. Brimson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5007) granting a pension to J. L. Hull—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5008) granting a pension to George Bingaman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5009) granting a pension to Emaranda Sommerville—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5010) granting a pension to Ferdinand Schmadel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5011) for the relief of Charles Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5012) for the relief of Elishama Beaty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5013) for the relief of Jasper C. Banks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5014) for the relief of William Goldsbrough—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5015) for the relief of Clarence Frederick Chapman, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5016) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of W. B. Chamness—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5017) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George Forbus, alias George Davidson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5018) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George W. Terrell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5019) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John D. Woods—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5020) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Frederick Feninger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5021) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Robert G. Waud—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5022) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Arnold, alias Jackson Arnold—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5023) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of W. B. Chamness—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5024) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Brice Prater—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5025) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Lewis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5026) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Henry Benjamin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5027) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jubal Grant and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5028) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George R. Spore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5029) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Armstrong Hunter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5030) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Herman Kneofler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5031) to remove charge of desertion from the record of Jacob Morrison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5032) to correct the record of Allen Byers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5033) to correct the military record of Francis M. Price—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 5034) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 5035) granting an increase of pension to D. J. Wardwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5036) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Violette—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5037) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5038) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Sanborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5039) granting an increase of pension to James J. Reeves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5040) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Pomeroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5041) granting an increase of pension to William K. Nason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5042) granting an increase of pension to Michael Collins, 2d—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5043) granting an increase of pension to Ira L. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5044) granting an increase of pension to Thaxter Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5045) granting an increase of pension to Ira Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5046) granting an increase of pension to George E. Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5047) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Archer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5048) granting a pension to Emma R. Emery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5049) for the relief of Emma R. Emery—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 5050) granting a pension to William F. Neet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5051) granting a pension to Jefferson Knaus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5052) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5053) granting a pension to Lucy F. Melton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5054) granting a pension to Harriet L. Gist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5055) granting a pension to Solomon Coan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5056) granting a pension to Mary Wehrmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5057) granting a pension to Samuel Moser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5058) granting a pension to Robert S. Hoge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5059) granting a pension to Samuel Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5060) granting a pension to Thomas B. Maberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5061) granting a pension to James G. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5062) granting a pension to Jesse G. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5063) granting a pension to Vina Lindemower—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5064) granting a pension to Oliver P. Jackson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) granting an increase of pension to O. A. Stine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel B. Petts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5068) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon N. Boardman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5069) granting an increase of pension to William H. Lyman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5070) granting an increase of pension to Logan Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5071) granting an increase of pension to Michael Coplinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5072) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Whitsett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5073) for the relief of Greene County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) to correct the military record of Rudolph Kraut—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 5075) granting a pension to Agnes Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 5076) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin G. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 5077) granting an increase of pension to Alvis H. Thomasson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of D. C. Manire—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5079) for the relief of F. S. McKady—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of Jordan H. Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Lewis M. Maney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Benjamin Lillard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5083) for the relief of the heirs of William Bradshaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5084) for the relief of the heirs of Caswell Puckett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5085) to correct the military record of E. D. Judkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOYCE: A bill (H. R. 5086) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Marlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5087) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 5088) granting an increase of pension to James Spealman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5089) granting an increase of pension to Lewis I. Renaut—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 5090) granting an increase of pension to Fetter Sheelar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 5091) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Buttner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5092) granting a pension to Anson Greenwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5093) granting an increase of pension to John C. Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5094) granting an increase of pension to Albert Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5095) granting an increase of pension to James Noble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5096) granting an increase of pension to Harry C. Gordon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5097) granting an increase of pension to Oliver M. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5098) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) granting a pension to Arthur H. Sproat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5101) granting a pension to Henrietta P. Lull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5102) granting a pension to Emma R. Deyo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5103) granting a pension to Ruth A. Frazier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 5104) for the relief of W. R. Trotter and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 5105) granting an increase of pension to William McNew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5106) granting an increase of pension to James H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5107) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Fye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5108) granting an increase of pension to George W. Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5109) granting an increase of pension to Robert Glover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5110) granting a pension to Horace Stambaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5111) granting a pension to Anna Levi—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5112) granting a pension to Louise Theobald—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5113) to correct the military record of William Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5114) to correct the military record of Henry J. McBroom—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5115) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John D. Cohee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5116) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Ezekiel W. Cohee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5117) granting a pension to Lydia Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 5118) for the relief of the heirs of Augusta W. Diehl, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5119) for the relief of R. C. Robison, heir of David Robison of Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 5120) granting a pension to Mary Kuchar—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) granting a pension to Anton Slama—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5122) granting an increase of pension to James Rozporka—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5123) for the relief of heirs of Adele Fowler, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 5124) granting an increase of pension to William H. Richmond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 5125) granting an increase of pension to Francis Hoey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5126) for the relief of the heirs of Jenkins & Havens—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 5127) granting a pension to Peter J. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLACE: A bill (H. R. 5128) for the relief of Rebecca Walthall, widow, and the heirs of John Walthall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 5129) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Laughner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5130) granting an increase of pension to Jonas L. Mull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5131) granting an increase of pension to James A. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5132) granting an increase of pension to John W. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5133) granting an increase of pension to Freeland H. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5134) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Pettigrew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5135) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5136) granting an increase of pension to Elias M. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5137) granting an increase of pension to Walter Harwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5138) granting an increase of pension to George W. Soles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5139) granting an increase of pension to John Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5140) granting an increase of pension to John E. Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5141) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Van Naten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5142) granting a pension to Adaline Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5143) granting a pension to William P. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5144) granting a pension to James S. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5145) granting a pension to George Warren Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5146) granting a pension to John Sutherland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5147) for the relief of Alexander Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5148) granting an honorable discharge to Lucien P. Rogers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5149) to correct the war record of Caleb F. Higbee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5150) correcting record of Oliver M. Hanna—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5151) correcting record of John Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of Charles and Anna Grock, asking for an investigation of alleged oppression of themselves in the federal court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of George D. Fischer and others, of New York, against duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of L. C. Campbell, of Gratiot, and F. R. Martin, of Roscoe, Ohio, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARLIN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Mrs. William C. Fitzhugh—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOK: Petition of the Pennsylvania Free Hide League, favoring removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Bush & Rayner, of Philadelphia, against reduction of the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the German-American Hosiery Company, Thomas E. Brown & Son, Lee Hosiery Mills, employees of the Brown Knitting Company, Thomas W. Buck Hosiery Company, employees of William B. Threapleton's Sons, and the Glenn Knitting Company, all of Philadelphia, Pa., against any changes in tariff schedules on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry voters of the First Congressional District of Wisconsin, favoring repeal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of citizens of Clinton, Iowa, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, Local Union No. 2, Sandy Hill, N. Y., against reduction of the tariff on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico, favoring tariff on coffee and retention of tariff on tea and tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: Petitions of Thomas Woods & Son and James U. Myers, of Zenas; Blish Milling Company, of Seymour; and Grafton Johnson, of Greenwood, all in the State of Indiana, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: Petition of Miles Clark, of Erieville, N. Y., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce in favor of countervailing duty on petroleum—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Jackson Grocery Company and San Francisco Labor Union, against duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of E. C. Kopp & Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring increase of duty on post cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rockford (Ill.) Lodge, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for a reserve in Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Clooke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Paepcke-Leicht Lumber Company of Chicago, opposing reduction of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of T. Murray McCallum, of Streator, Ill., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Lodge, No. 255, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an appropriation to create a reserve in the State of Wyoming for the protection of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a petition of local union of the American Society of Equity of Ramsey County, N. Dak., against reduction of the present duties on grains—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of H. D. Siebring and 5 others, of Holland, Minn., against parcels-post and postal savings bank bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Fred Frutiger, of Holland, Minn., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Agnes Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of F. G., F. A., and L. D. Wool, of San Jose, Cal., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of representatives of the entire commercial interests of the Pacific coast, for government operated or assisted line of steamships in the Pacific Ocean—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of San Francisco and San Jose, Cal., against duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Saghaunuck Grange, No. 100, Ellsworth, Conn., favoring legislation for parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Somerset Grange, No. 1662, of Barnesville, Ohio, asking for reduction of duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Lumbermen's Exchange of Philadelphia, favoring increase of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOYCE: Petition of J. T. Shuman and sundry citizens of Guernsey and Noble counties, Ohio, against reduction of the tariff on wools—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of National Coffee and Tea Association, protesting against any duty on coffee and tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of Manchester Grange, No. 1374, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring establishment of parcels post and United States banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LASSITER: Petition of Petersburg (Va.) Lodge, No. 237, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an American elk reservation in Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of 900 woolen mill workers of North Adams, Mass., against reduction of existing tariff duties on woolen goods of foreign manufacture—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWDEN: Petition of C. C. Pease and others, of the Thirteenth Illinois District, favoring repeal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McHENRY: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sunbury (Pa.) Lodge, No. 267, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an appropriation to create a reserve in the State of Wyoming for the protection of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOORE of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of W. B. Trotter—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: Petitions of employees of Grand Rapids Pulp and Paper Company; also employees of Ne Kos Ka Edwards Paper Company, of Wisconsin, against reduction of tariff on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of certain residents of Hastings, Nebr., against parcels-post and postal savings bank bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. REID: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James A. Hill, heir of Jane Rose—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Post Card Manufacturers and Allied Trades Protective Association, favoring tariff on lithographic prints as per Payne tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Seaboard Trading Company, favoring reduction of duty on salt fish—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWASEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Bath, Me., and vicinity, and Portland, Me., and vicinity, for improvement of Bass Harbor bar and Deer Island thoroughfare, on coast of Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: Petition of citizens of Michigan, favoring creation of National Highways Commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Houghton, Vulcan, and Negaunee, all of Michigan, opposing duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 26, 1909.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD certain editorials from the Engineering News, entitled "The reasons why the lock plan for the Panama Canal is preferable to the sea-level plan," together with the accompanying illustrations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the matter referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made any inquiry as to the cost of the illustrations which he asks to have printed?

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, the cost of the illustrations will be nothing at all. The printing will be the mere item. The illustrations will be furnished by the Engineering News, if permission is given to have them appear.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very doubtful practice, a practice that is open to many objections, to fill the RECORD with illustrations, aside from purely outline cuts that are necessary to illuminate the text. I would further inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania if his illustrations have any other purpose, and if they are necessary to an understanding of the text?

Mr. WANGER. I think they are reasonably necessary, Mr. Speaker, to an understanding of the text. Many of them are simply engineering sketches.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. WANGER. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state in regard to this that that is one of the best articles on the Panama Canal that has ever been written. The Engineering News sent one of its editors, a civil engineer named Baker, who is an expert on these matters, at its own expense, and not on the ship that the present President of the United States used, to examine and report the facts as he found them on the Panama Canal, and the reasons why the lock system should prevail. I am familiar with the article, hence I speak knowingly. These illustrations, while not absolutely essential, will be of the greatest service in understanding the text. To an engineer they would not be necessary, but to a layman I think they would be, and therefore I hope the gentleman's request will prevail.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, having been given an opportunity to examine the illustrations, I wish to remark that I would withdraw my objection if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER] will limit his request to a consent to have printed such drawings as are necessary to illustrate the text. It certainly is not necessary to publish a half-tone picture showing the scene of a sinking of a railway track over the black swamp in Panama or to have a picture of the Chagres River near Gorgona. There are several pictures of that character, and I would suggest to the gentleman it would be well for him to limit his request to such outline drawings as are necessary to illustrate and make plain the text.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I should be sorry to limit the request exclusively to outline drawings, as I think the photograph of the so-called "flat arch" of the old church in Panama it would be well to have printed.